3 vols
6/-
Stanford
APR 1 6 193

824.08
Ox2
[v.2]

DOMINICAN COLLEGE
LIBRARY
SAN RAFAEL

AS122 .093 1855
vol.2
Oxford essays

DOMINICAN COLLEGE
LIBRARY
SAN RAFAEL

Oxford Eſſays.

Preparing for the Preſs,

Cambridge Eſſays,

contributed by

Members of the University.

1856.

J Hutchinson

Oxford Essays,

contributed by

Members of the University.

1856.

London:

John W. Parker and Son,

West Strand.

DOMINICAN COLLEGE LIBRARY SAN RAFAEL

824.08
Ox 2
v.2

LONDON:
SAVILL AND EDWARDS, PRINTERS, CHANDOS STREET,
COVENT GARDEN.

25906

ADVERTISEMENT.

THE encouragement given to the first volumes of the *Oxford* and *Cambridge Essays* has been sufficiently great to warrant their continuance during the present year, and to inspire a strong hope that the series may be carried on in future years with success.

It may not, perhaps, be superfluous to repeat that these essays are not intended to advocate any one set of opinions, and that the writers are quite independent of one another, and wish, by affixing their names to their respective contributions, to incur each the sole responsibility of what he writes. Nor has any attempt been made to select the subjects that happen to be most interesting at the time of publication, or to treat the subjects chosen in the manner most likely to appeal to the popular taste. It is rather the general aim of the undertaking that contributors should only write on subjects long familiar to them, and to which their studies and thoughts have been mainly directed. It is only in this way that these volumes can have any value. When the first novelty of the series is over, it is impossible that it should have any permanent success, unless the essays contain some of the results

obtained by the writers in the special branch or branches of study which they have selected out of the many opened to them by a University education. This must be the apology, if an apology is needed, for the contents of this volume. Some of the essays are long, and most are on subjects which cannot be said to be of general interest. It is hoped that, in return, the reader will find himself in the hands of writers who have really some acquaintance with the subjects of which they treat.

CONTENTS.

Essay — Page

I. *Comparative Mythology.* By Max Müller, M.A., Christ-church, Taylorian Professor 1

II. *The Growth of Laws and Usages of War.* By Montague Bernard, B.C.L., Trinity College . . 88

III. *The Raphael Drawings in the University Galleries, Oxford.* By the Rev. George Butler, M.A., late Fellow of Exeter College 137

IV. *The Land System of Ireland.* By William O'Connor Morris, B.A., Oriel College 193

V. *National Education.* By the Rev. Frederick Temple, M.A., late Fellow of Balliol College . . . 218

VI. *Carlovingian Romance.* By Richard John King, B.A., Exeter College 271

VII. *Review of Mr. Congreve's 'Roman Empire of the West.'* By Goldwin Smith, M.A., Fellow of University College 295

OXFORD ESSAYS.

COMPARATIVE MYTHOLOGY.

Phædros. Dost thou see that very tall plane-tree?

Sokrates. Certainly I do.

Phædros. There is shade there, and the wind is not too strong, and there is grass to sit, or, if we like, to lie down.

Sokrates. Lead on then!

Phædros. Tell me, Sokrates,—is it not from some place here they say that Boreas carried away Oreithyia from the Ilissos?

Sokrates. So they say.

Phædros. Should it not be from this spot? for the waters seem so lovely, and pure, and transparent, and as if made for girls to play on the bank.

Sokrates. No; it is two or three stadia further down, where you cross over to the Temple of Agra,—and there you find, somewhere, an altar of Boreas.

Phædros. I was not aware of this. But tell me, by Zeus, O Sokrates,—doest *thou* believe this mythe to be true?

Sokrates. Well, if I did not believe it, like the wise people, I should not be so very far wrong; and I might set up an ingenious theory and say that a gust of Boreas, the Northwind, carried her down from the rocks in the neighbourhood, while she was playing with her friend Pharmakeia; and that, having died in this manner, she was reported to have been carried off from thence by Boreas, or from the Ares-peak,—for there goes also this story, that she was carried off from that, and not from this spot. As to myself, Phædros, I think these explanations, on the whole, very pleasant; but they require a man of strong mind and hard work, and a man who, after all, is not much to be envied, if it were only for this, that when he has set right this one fable, he is bound to do the same for the form of the Hippokentaurs, and again for that of the Chimæra. And then

a host of such beings rushes in,—Gorgons and Pegasos', and masses of other hopeless beings, and absurdities of monstrous creatures. And if a man, not believing in the existence of these creatures, should try to represent each according to the probable explanation, dealing in a rough kind of philosophy,—he would require abundance of leisure. I, at least, have no time to spare for these things, and the reason, my friend, is this—that I cannot yet, according to the Delphic line, know myself; and it seems to me ridiculous that a man who does not yet know this, should trouble himself about what does not concern him. Therefore I leave those things alone, and, believing what other people believe about them, I meditate, as I said just now, not on them, but on myself,—whether I be a monster more complicated and more savage than Typhon, or a tamer and simpler creature, enjoying by nature a blessed and modest lot. But while we are talking, my friend,—was not this the tree to which thou wert to lead us?

Phædros. This is the very tree.

THIS passage, from the Introduction of Plato's *Phædros*, has been frequently quoted in order to show what the wisest of the Greeks thought about the rationalists of his day. There were at Athens then, as there have been at all times and in all countries, men who had no sense for the miraculous and supernatural, and who, without having the moral courage to deny altogether what they could not bring themselves to believe, endeavoured to find some plausible explanation by which the sacred legends which tradition had handed down to them, and which had been hallowed by religious observances, and sanctioned by the authority of the law, might be brought into harmony with the dictates of reason and the laws of nature. That Sokrates, though accused himself of heresy, did not entertain a very high opinion of these speculators,—that he thought their explanations more incredible and absurd than even the most incredible absurdities of Greek mythology,—nay, that at a certain period of his life he treated such attempts as impious, is clear from this and other passages of Plato and Xenophon.

But if Mr. Grote, in his classical work on the *History of Greece*, avails himself of this and similar passages, in order to introduce, as it were, Sokrates himself among the historians and critics of our own time,—if he endeavours to make him bear witness 'to the uselessness' of digging for a supposed basis of truth' in the mythes of the Greek world, he makes the ancient philosopher say more than he really said. Our object in considering the mythes of the Greeks, or any other nation of antiquity, is so different from that of Sokrates, that the objections which he urged against his rationalising contem-

poraries could hardly be said to apply to us. Nay, I believe it can be shown that, from our point of view, their study forms part of that very problem the solution of which Sokrates considered to be the only worthy object of philosophy. For what is it that makes us at the present day ask the question of the origin of the Greek mythes? Why do men study ancient history, acquire a knowledge of dead languages, and decipher illegible inscriptions? What inspires them with an interest not only in the literature of Greece and Rome, but of ancient India and Persia, of Egypt and Babylonia? Why do the puerile and often repulsive legends of savage tribes rivet their attention and engage their thoughts? Have we not been told that there is more wisdom in the *Times* than in Thukydides? Are not the novels of Walter Scott more amusing than Apollodorus? or the works of Bacon more instructive than the cosmogony of the Purânas? What, then, gives life to the study of antiquity? What compels men, in the midst of these busy times, to sacrifice their leisure to studies apparently so unattractive and useless, if not the conviction, that in order to obey the Delphic commandment—in order to know *what Man is*, we ought to know *what Man has been?* This is a view as foreign to the mind of Sokrates as any of the principles of inductive philosophy by which men like Columbus, Leonardo da Vinci, Copernicus, Kepler, Bacon, and Galileo regenerated and invigorated the intellectual life of modern Europe. If we grant to Sokrates that the chief object of philosophy is that man should know himself, we should hardly consider his means of arriving at this knowledge adequate to so high an aim. To his mind man was pre-eminently the individual, the human soul by itself, without any reference to its being but one manifestation of a power, or, as he might have said, an idea, realised in and through an endless variety of human souls. He is ever seeking to solve the mystery of human nature by brooding over his own mind, by watching the secret workings of the soul, by analysing the organs of knowledge, and by trying to determine their proper limits; and thus the last result of his philosophy was, that he knew but one thing, and this was, that he knew nothing. To us, man is no longer this solitary being, complete in itself, and self-sufficient; man to us is a brother among brothers, a member of a class, of a genus, or a kind, and therefore intelligible only with reference to his equals. The earth was unintelligible to the ancients, because looked upon as a solitary being, without a peer in the whole universe; but it assumed a new and true significance as soon as it rose before the eye of man as one of many planets, all governed by the

same laws, and all revolving around the same centre. It is the same with the human soul, and its nature stands before our mind in quite a different light since man has been taught to know and feel himself as a member of one great family,—as one of the myriads of wandering stars, all governed by the same laws, and all revolving around the same centre, and all deriving their light from the same source. The history of the world, or, as it is called, 'Universal History,' has laid open new avenues of thought, and it has enriched our language with a word which never passed the lips of Sokrates, or Plato, or Aristotle—*man-kind*. Where the Greek saw barbarians, we see brethren; where the Greek saw heroes and demi-gods, we see our parents and ancestors; where the Greek saw nations (ἔθνη), we see mankind, toiling and suffering, separated by oceans, divided by language, and severed by national enmity, —yet evermore tending, under a divine control, towards the fulfilment of that inscrutable purpose for which the world was created, and man placed in it, bearing the image of God. History, therefore, with its dusty and mouldering pages, is to us as sacred a volume as the book of nature. In both we read, or we try to read, the reflex of the laws and thoughts of a Divine Wisdom. As we acknowledge no longer in nature the working of demons or the manifestation of an evil principle, so we deny in history an atomistic conglomerate of chances, or the despotic rule of a mute fate. We believe that there is nothing irrational in History and Nature, and that the human mind is called upon to read and to revere in both the manifestations of a Divine Power. Hence, even the most ancient and shattered pages of traditions are dear to us, nay dearer, perhaps, than the more copious chapters of modern times. The history of those distant ages and distant men—apparently so foreign to our modern interests,—assumes a new charm as soon as we know that it tells us the story of our own race, of our own family—nay, of our own selves. Sometimes, when opening a desk which we have not opened for many years,—when looking over letters which we have not read for many years, we read on for some time with a cold indifference, and though we see it is our own handwriting, and though we meet with names once familiar to our heart, yet we can hardly believe that *we* wrote these letters, that *we* felt those pangs, that *we* shared in those delights, till at last the past draws near and we draw near to the past, and our heart grows warm, and we feel again as we felt of old, and we know that these letters were *our* letters. It is the same in reading ancient history: at first it seems something strange and foreign; but the more intensely we read, the more our thoughts are

engaged and our feelings warmed; and the history of those ancient men becomes, as it were, our own history,—their sufferings *our* sufferings,—their joys *our* joys. Without this sympathy, history is a dead letter, and might as well be burnt and forgotten; while, if it is once enlivened by this feeling, it appeals not only to the antiquarian, but to the heart of every man. We find ourselves on a stage on which many acts have been acted before us, and where we are suddenly called to act our own part. To know the part which we have to act ourselves, we ought to know the character of those whose place we take. We naturally look back to the scenes on which the curtain of the past has fallen, for we believe that there ought to be *one* thought pervading the whole drama of mankind. And here history steps in, and gives us the thread which connects the present with the past. Many scenes, it is true, are lost beyond the hope of recovery; and the most interesting, the opening scenes of the childhood of the human race, are known to us by small fragments only. But for this very reason the antiquarian, if he descries a relic of those early times, grasps it with the eagerness of a biographer who finds unexpectedly some scraps written by his hero when yet a child—entirely himself, and before the shadows of life had settled on his brow. In whatever language it may be written, every line, every word, is welcome, that bears the impress of the early days of mankind. In our museums we collect the rude playthings of our hero's boyhood, and we try to guess from their colossal features the thoughts of the mind which they once reflected. Many things are still unintelligible to us, and the hieroglyphic language of antiquity records but half of the mind's unconscious intentions. Yet more and more the image of man, in whatever clime we meet him, rises before us, noble and pure from the very beginning: even his errors we learn to understand,—even his dreams we begin to interpret. As far as we can trace back the footsteps of man, even on the lowest strata of history, we see that the divine gift of a sound and sober intellect belonged to him from the very first; and the idea of a humanity emerging slowly from the depths of an animal brutality can never be maintained again. The earliest work of art wrought by the human mind,—more ancient than any literary document, and prior even to the first whisperings of tradition,—the *human language*, forms an uninterrupted chain from the first dawn of history down to our own times. We still speak the language of the first ancestors of our race; and this language, with its wonderful structure, bears witness against such unhallowed imputations.

The formation of language, the composition of roots, the gradual discrimination of meanings, the systematic elaboration of grammatical forms—all this working which we can still see under the surface of our own speech, attests from the very first the presence of a rational mind—of an artist as great, at least, as his work. This period, during which expressions were coined for the most necessary ideas,—such as pronouns, prepositions, numerals, and the household words of the simplest life,—a period to which we must assign the first beginnings of a free and simply agglutinative grammar,—a grammar not impressed as yet with any individual or national peculiarities, yet containing the germs of all the Turanian, as well as the Arian and Semitic forms of speech,—this period forms the first in the history of man,—the first, at least, to which even the keenest eye of the antiquarian and the philosopher can reach,—and we call it the *Rhematic Period.*

This is succeeded by a second period, during which we must suppose that at least two families of language left the simply agglutinative, or nomadic stage of grammar, and received, once for all, that peculiar impress of their formative system which we still find in all the dialects and national idioms comprised under the names of *Semitic* and *Arian*, as distinguished from the *Turanian*, the latter retaining to a much later period, and in some instances to the present day, that agglutinative reproductiveness which has rendered a traditional and metamorphic system of grammar impossible, or has at least considerably limited its extent. Hence we do not find in the nomadic or Turanian languages scattered from China to the Pyrenees, from Cape Comorin, across the Caucasus, to Lapland, that traditional family likeness which enables us to treat the Teutonic, Celtic, Windic, Italic, Hellenic, Iranic, and Indic languages on one side, and the Arabian, Aramean, and Hebrew dialects on the other, as mere varieties of two specific forms of speech, in which, at a very early period, and through influences decidedly political, if not individual and personal, the floating elements of grammar have been arrested and made to assume an amalgamated, instead of a merely agglutinative character. This second is called the *Dialectical Period.*

Now, after these two periods, but before the appearance of the first traces of any national literature, there is a period, represented everywhere by the same characteristic features,—a kind of Eocene period, commonly called the *Mythological* or *Mythopœic Age*. It is a period in the history of the human mind, perhaps the most difficult to understand, and the most likely to shake our faith in the regular progress of the human intellect. We can form a tolerably clear idea of the origin of language, of the gradual

formation of grammar, and the unavoidable divergence of dialects and languages. We can understand, again, the earliest concentrations of political societies, the establishment of laws and customs, and the first beginnings of religion and poetry. But between the two there is a gulf which it seems impossible for any philosophy to bridge over. We call it the *Mythic Period*, and we have accustomed ourselves to believe that the Greeks, for instance, such as we find them represented to us in the Homeric poems, far advanced in the fine arts, acquainted with the refinements and comforts of life, such as we see at the palaces of Menelaos and Alkinoos, with public meetings and elaborate pleadings, with the mature wisdom of a Nestor and the cunning enterprise of an Odysseus, with the dignity of a Helena and the loveliness of a Nausikaa, could have been preceded by a race of men whose chief amusement consisted in inventing absurd tales about gods and other nondescript beings,—a race of men, in fact, on whose tomb the historian could inscribe no better epigram than that on Bitto and Phainis. Although later poets may have given to some of these fables a charm of beauty, and led us to accept them as imaginative compositions, it is impossible to conceal the fact that, taken by themselves, and in their literal meaning, most of these ancient mythes are absurd and irrational, and frequently opposed to the principles of thought, religion, and morality which guided the Greeks as soon as they appear to us in the twilight of traditional history. By whom, then, were these stories invented?—stories, we must say at once, identical in form and character, whether we find them on Indian, Persian, Greek, Italian, Slavonic, or Teutonic soil. Was there a period of temporary insanity, through which the human mind had to pass, and was it a madness identically the same in the south of India and in the north of Iceland? It is impossible to believe that a people, who, in the very infancy of thought, produced men like Thales, Herakleitos, and Pythagoras, should have consisted of idle talkers but a few centuries before the time of these sages. Even if we take only that part of mythology which refers to religion, in our sense of the word, or the mythes which bear on the highest problems of philosophy—such as the creation, the relation of man to God, life and death, virtue and vice,—mythes generally the most modern in origin, we find that even this small portion, which might be supposed to contain some sober ideas, or some pure and sublime conceptions, is unworthy of the ancestors of the Homeric poets, or the Ionic philosophers. If the swineherd Eumæos, unacquainted, perhaps, with the intricate system of the Olympian mythology, speaks of the

Deity, he speaks like one of ourselves. 'Eat,' he says to Odysseus, 'and enjoy what is here, for God will grant one thing, but another he will refuse, whatever he will in his mind, for he can do all things.'* This, we may suppose, was the language of the common people at the time of Homer, and it is simple and sublime, if compared with what has been supposed one of the grandest conceptions of Greek mythology, that, namely, where Zeus, in order to assert his omnipotence, tells the gods, that if they took a rope, and all the gods and goddesses pulled on one side, they could not drag him down from the heaven to the earth; while, if he chose, he could pull them all up, and suspend the earth and the sea from the summit of Olympos. What is more ridiculous than the mythological account of the creation of the human race by Deukalion and Pyrrha throwing stones behind them (a mythe which owes its origin to a mere pun on λάος and λᾶας), while we can hardly expect, among pagans, a more profound conception of the relation between God and man—than the saying of Herakleitos,—'Men are mortal gods, and gods are immortal men.' Let us think of the times which could bear a Lykurgos and a Solon,—which could found an Areopagos and the Olympic games, and how can we imagine that, a few generations before that time, the highest notions of the Godhead among the Greeks were adequately expressed by the story of Uranos maimed by Kronos,—of Kronos eating his children, swallowing a stone, and vomiting out alive his whole progeny. Among the lowest tribes of Africa and America we hardly find anything more hideous and revolting. It is shutting our eyes to the difficulties which stare us in the face, if we say, like Mr. Grote, that this mythology was 'a past which was never present;' and it seems blasphemy to consider these fables of the heathen world as corrupted and misinterpreted fragments of a divine revelation once granted to the whole race of mankind — a view so frequently advocated by Christian divines. These mythes have been made by man at a certain period of history. There *was* an age which produced these mythes,—an age half-way between the Dialectical Period—presenting the human race gradually diverging into different families and languages, and the National Period—exhibiting to us the earliest traces of nationalised language, and a nationalised literature in India, Persia, Greece, Italy, and Germany. The fact is there, and we must either explain it, or admit in the

---

* *Od.* x. 443. Ἔσθιε, δαιμόνιε ξείνων, καὶ τέρπεο τοῖσδε
Οἷα πάρεστι· θεὸς δὲ τὸ μὲν δώσει τὸ δ' ἐάσει,
Ὅττί κεν ᾧ θυμῷ ἐθέλῃ· δύναται γὰρ ἅπαντα.

gradual growth of the human mind, as in the formation of the earth, some violent revolutions, which broke the regularity of the early strata of thought, and convulsed the human mind, like volcanos and earthquakes arising from some unknown cause, below the surface of history.

Much, however, will be gained if, without being driven to adopt so violent and repugnant a theory, we are able to account in a more intelligible manner for the creation of mythes. Their propagation and subsistence in later times, though strange in many respects, is yet a much less intricate problem. The human mind has an inborn reverence for the past, and the religious piety of the man flows from the same natural spring as the filial piety of the child. Even though the traditions of past ages may appear strange, wild, and sometimes immoral, or impossible, each generation accepts them, and fashions them so that they can be borne with again, and even made to disclose a true and deeper meaning. Many of the natives of India, though versed in European science, and imbued with the principles of a pure natural theology, yet bow down and worship the images of Vish*n*u and *S*iva. They know that these images are but stone; they confess that their feelings revolt against the impurities attributed to these gods by what they call their sacred writings; yet there are honest Brahmans who will maintain that these stories have a deeper meaning,—that immorality being incompatible with a divine being, a mystery *must* be supposed to be concealed in these time-hallowed fables,—a mystery which an inquiring and reverent mind may hope to fathom. Nay, even where Christian missionaries have been successful, where the purity of the Christian faith has won the heart of a native, and made the extravagant absurdities of the Purâ*n*as insupportable to him, the faith of his early childhood will still linger on and break out occasionally in unguarded expressions, as several of the mythes of antiquity have crept into the legends of the Church of Rome.* We find frequent indications in ancient history that the Greeks themselves were shocked by the stories told of their gods; yet as even in our own times faith with most men is not faith in God or in truth, but faith in the faith of others, we may understand why even men like Sokrates were unwilling to renounce their belief in what had been believed by their fathers. As their idea of the Godhead became purer, they also felt that the idea of perfection, involved in the idea of a divine being, excluded the possibility of immoral gods. Pindar, as pointed out by Otfried

* See Grimm's Introduction to his great work on *Teutonic Mythology*. Second edition, 1844, p. xxxi.

Müller,* changes many mythes because they are not in harmony with his purer conceptions of the dignity of gods and heroes; and, because, according to his opinion, they *must be false*. Plato† argues in a similar spirit when he examines the different traditions about Eros, and in the *Symposium* we see how each speaker maintains that mythe of Eros to be the only true one which agrees best with his own ideas of the nature of this god,—Phædros‡ calling him the oldest, Agathon the youngest of the gods; yet each appealing to the authority of an ancient mythe. Thus, men who had as clear a conception of the omnipotence and omnipresence of a supreme God as natural religion can reveal, still called him Zeus, forgetting the adulterer and parricide.

'Ζεὺς ἀρχὴ, Ζεὺς μέσσα, Διὸς δ' ἐκ πάντα τέτυκται.'

'Zeus is the beginning, Zeus the middle; out of Zeus all things have been made.'

—an Orphic line, but an old one, if, as Mr. Grote supposes, Plato alluded to it.§ Poets again, who felt in their hearts the true emotion of prayer, a yearning after divine help and protection, still spoke of Zeus, forgetting that at one time Zeus himself was vanquished by Titan and delivered by Hermes.‖ Aeschylos¶ says:—'Zeus, whoever he is, if this be the name by which he loves to be called—by this name I address him. For, pondering on all things except Zeus, I cannot tell whether I may truly cast off the idle burden from my thought.'

No, the preservation of these mythic names, the long life of these fables, and their satisfying the religious, poetical, and moral wants of succeeding generations, though strange and in-

---

* See O. Müller's excellent work, *Prolegomena zu einer wissenschaftlichen Mythologie*, 1825, p. 87.

† *Phædros*, 242, E.

‡ *Symp.* 178, C. οὕτως πολλαχόθεν ὁμολογεῖται ὁ Ἔρως ἐν τοῖς πρεσβυτάτοις εἶναι· πρεσβύτατος δὲ ὢν μεγίστων ἀγαθῶν ἡμῖν αἴτιός ἐστιν· 195, A. ἔστι δὲ κάλλιστος ὢν τοιόσδε· πρῶτον μὲν νεώτατος θεῶν, ὦ Φαῖδρε.

§ Lobeck, *Aglaoph.* p. 523, gives

Ζεὺς κεφαλὴ Ζεὺς μέσσα Διὸς δ'ἐκ πάντα τέτυκται.

See Preller's *Greek Mythology*, 1854, p. 99.

‖ *Apollod.* 1, 6, 3, Grote, H. G. p. 4.

¶ I give the text, because it has been translated in so many different ways:—

Agam. 155. 'Ζεύς, ὅστις ποτ' ἐστιν, εἰ τόδ' αὐ
τῷ φίλον κεκλημένῳ,
τοῦτό νιν προσεννέπω·
οὐκ ἔχω προσεικάσαι,
πάντ' ἐπισταθμώμενος
πλὴν Διός, εἰ τὸ μάταν ἀπὸ φρόντιδος ἄχθος
χρὴ βαλεῖν ἐτητύμως.'

structive, is not the real difficulty. The past has its charms, and Tradition has a powerful friend in Language. We still speak of the sun rising and setting, of rainbows, of thunderbolts, because Language has sanctioned these expressions. We use them, though we do not believe in them. The difficulty is how at first the human mind was led to such imaginings,—how the names and tales arose, and unless this question can be answered, our belief in a regular and consistent progress of the human intellect, through all ages and in all countries, must be given up as a false theory.

Nor can it be said that we know absolutely nothing of this period during which the as yet undivided Arian nations—for it is chiefly of them that we are now speaking—formed their mythes. Even if we saw only the deep shadow which lies on the Greek mind from the very beginning of its political and literary history, we should be able to infer from it something of the real character of that age which must have preceded the earliest dawn of the national literature of Greece. Otfried Müller,* though he was unacquainted with the new light which comparative philology has shed on this primitive Arian period, says, 'The mythic form of expression which changes all beings into persons, all relations into actions, is something so peculiar that we must admit for its growth *a distinct period* in the civilization of a people.' But comparative philology has since brought this whole period within the pale of documentary history. It has placed in our hands a telescope of such power that, where formerly we could see but nebulous clouds, we now discover distinct forms and outlines; nay, it has given us what we may call contemporary evidence, exhibiting to us the state of thought, language, religion, and civilization at a period when Sanskrit was not yet Sanskrit, Greek not yet Greek, but when both, together with Latin, German, and other Arian dialects, existed as yet as *one* undivided language, in the same manner as French, Italian, and Spanish may be said to have at one time existed as *one* undivided language, in the form of Latin.

This will require a short explanation. If we knew nothing of the existence of Latin—if all historical documents previous to the fifteenth century had been lost—if tradition, even, was silent as to the former existence of a Roman empire, a mere comparison of the six Romance dialects would enable us to say, that at some time there must have been a language from which all these modern dialects derived their origin in common; for without this supposition it would be impossible to account for the facts exhibited by

* *Prol. Myth.* 78.

these dialects. Let us look at the auxiliary verb. We find:—

	Italian.	Wallachian.	Rhætian.	Spanish.	Portuguese.	French.
I am:	sono	sum (sunt)	sunt	soy	sou	suis
Thou art:	sei	es	eis	eres	es	es
He is:	e	é (este)	ei	es	he	est
We are:	siamo	sùntemu	essen	somos	somos	sommes
You are:	siete	sùnteți	esses	sois	sois	êtes (estes)
They are:	sono	sùnt	eân (sun)	son	são	sont.

It is clear, even from a short consideration of these forms, first, that all are but varieties of one common type; secondly, that it is impossible to consider any one of these six paradigms as the original from which the others had been borrowed. To this we may add, thirdly, that in none of the languages to which these verbal forms belong, do we find the elements of which they could have been composed. If we find such forms as *j'ai aimé*, we can explain them by a mere reference to the radical means which French has still at its command, and the same may be said even of compounds like *j'aimerai*, i.e. *je-aimer-ai*, I have to love, I shall love. But a change from *je suis* to *tu es* is inexplicable by the light of French grammar. These forms could not have grown, so to speak, on French soil, but must have been handed down as relics from a former period —must have existed in some language antecedent to any of the Romance dialects. Now, fortunately, in this case, we are not left to a mere inference, but as we possess the Latin verb, we can prove how by phonetic corruption, and by mistaken analogies, every one of the six paradigms is but a national metamorphosis of the Latin original.

Let us now look at another set of paradigms:—

	Sanskrit.	Lithuanian.	Zend.	Doric.	Old Slavonic.	Latin.	Gothic.	Armen.
I am:	ásmi	esmi	ahmi	ἐμμι	yesmŭ	sum	im	em
Thou art:	ási	essi	ahi	ἐσσὶ	yesi	es	is	es
He is:	ásti	esti	asti	ἐστί	yestŏ	est	ist	ê
We (two) are:	'svás	esva	...	.....	yesva	...	siju	...
You (two) are:	'sthás	esta	stho?	ἐστόν	yesta	...	sijuts	...
They (two) are:	'stás	(esti)	sto?	ἐστόν	yesta	...	...	...
We are:	'smás	esmi	hmahi	ἐσμές	yesmŏ	sumus	sijum	emq
You are:	'stha	este	stha	ἐστέ	yeste	estis	sijup	êq
They are:	sánti	(esti)	hĕnti	ἐντί	somtĕ	sunt	sind	en.

From a careful consideration of these forms, we ought to draw exactly the same conclusions; firstly, that all are but varieties of one common type; secondly, that it is impossible to consider any of them as the original from which the others have been borrowed; and thirdly, that here again, none of the languages in which these verbal forms occur, possess the elements of which they were composed. That Sanskrit cannot be taken as the original from which all the rest were derived, (an opinion held by many scholars) is clear, if we see that Greek has, in several instances, preserved a more primitive, or, as it is called, more organic form than Sanskrit. Εσ-*μές* cannot be derived from the Sanskrit *smas*, because *smas* has lost

the radical a, which Greek has preserved, the root being *as*, to be, the termination *mas*, we. Nor can Greek be fixed upon as the more primitive language from which the others were derived, for not even Latin could be called the daughter of Greek, the language of Rome having preserved some forms more primitive than Greek; for instance, *sunt* instead of ἐντί or ἐνσί. Here Greek has lost the radical *as* altogether, ἐντί standing instead of ἐσεντι, while Latin has at least, like Sanskrit, preserved the radical s in *sunt=santi*.

Hence, all these dialects point to some more ancient language which was to them what Latin was to the Romance dialects,—only that at that early period there was no literature to preserve to us some remnants of that mother-tongue that died in giving birth to the modern Arian dialects, such as Sanskrit, Zend, Greek, Latin, Gothic, Windic, and Celtic. Yet, if there is any truth in inductive reasoning, that language was once a living language, spoken in Asia by a small tribe, nay, originally by a small family living under one and the same roof, as the language of Camoens, Cervantes, Voltaire, and Dante, was once spoken by a few peasants who had built their huts on the Seven Hills near the Tibris. If we compare the two tables of paradigms, the coincidences between the language of the Veda and the dialect spoken at the present day by the Lithuanian recruit at Berlin are greater by far than between French and Italian; and, after Bopp's *Comparative Grammar* has been completed, it will be seen clearly that all the essential forms of grammar had been fully framed and established before the first separation of the Arian family took place.

But we may learn much more of the intellectual state of the primitive and undivided family of the Arian nations, if we use the materials which Comparative Philology has placed at our disposal; and, here again, the Romance languages will teach us the spell by which we may hope to open the archives of the most distant antiquity of the Arian race. If we find in all the Romance dialects a word like the French *pont*, the Italian *ponte*, the Spanish *puente*, the Wallachian *pod*, identically the same in all, after making allowance for those peculiarities which give to each its national character, we have a right to say that *pons*, the name for *bridge*, was known *before* these languages separated, and that therefore, the art of building bridges must have been known at the same time. We could assert, even if we knew nothing of Latin and of Rome, that previous at least to the tenth century, books, bread, wine, houses, villages, towns, towers and gates, etc., were

known to those people, whoever they were, from whose language the modern dialects of Southern Europe are derived. It is true, we should not be able to draw a very perfect picture of the intellectual state of the Roman people if we were obliged to construct their history from such scanty materials; yet, we should be able to prove that there really was such a people, and, in the absence of any other information, even such casual glimpses would be welcome. But, though we might safely use this method positively, only taking care to avoid foreign terms, we could not convert it or use it negatively. Because each of the Romance dialects has a different name for certain objects, it does not follow that the objects themselves were unknown to the ancestors of the Romance nations. Paper was known at Rome, yet it is called *carta* in Italian, *papier* in French.

Now, as we know nothing of the Arian race, before it was broken up into different nationalities, such as Indian, German, Greek, Roman, Windic, Teutonic, and Celtic,—this method of making language itself tell the history of ancient times will become of great value, because it will give a character of historical reality to a period in the history of the human race, the very existence of which had been doubted, —to a period that had been called 'a past that was never present.' We must not expect a complete history of civilization, exhibiting in full detail a picture of the times when the language of Homer and of the Veda had not yet been formed. But we shall feel by some small but significant traits the real presence of that early period in the history of the human mind,—a period which, for reasons that will be clearer hereafter, we identify with the *Mythopœic*.

	Sanskrit.	Zend.	Greek.	Latin.	Gothic.	Slav.	Irish.
Father:	pitár	patar	πατήρ	pater	fadar	...	athair
Mother:	mâtár	mâtar	μήτηρ	mater	...	mati	mathair
Brother:	bhrâtar	brâta	(φρατήρ)	frater	brôþar	brat	brathair
Sister:	svásar	khaŋha	...	soror	svistar	sestra	siur
Daughter:	duhitar	dughdhar	θυγάτηρ	...	dauhtar (Lith.) dukte.		dear.

The mere fact, that the names for *father*, *mother*, *brother*, *sister*, and *daughter* are the same in most of the Arian languages, might at first sight seem of immaterial significance; yet, even these words are full of import. That the name of father was coined at that early period, shows that the father acknowledged the offspring of his wife as his own, for thus only had he a right to claim the title of father. *Father* is derived from a root Pa, which means, not to beget, but to protect, to support, to nourish. The father as genitor, was called in Sanskrit *g*anitár, but as protector and supporter of his offspring he was called pitár. Hence, in the Veda these

two names are used together, in order to express the full idea of father. Thus the poet says (I, 164, 33)—

Dyaús me pitâ' *g*anitâ'
Jovis mei pater genitor.
Ζεὺς ἐμοῦ πατὴρ γενετήρ.

In a similar manner mâtar, mother, is joined with *g*anitrî, genitrix (*Rv.* III. 48, 2), which shows that the word mâtar must soon have lost its etymological meaning, and have become an expression of respect and endearment. For among the early Arians, mâtar had the meaning of maker, from MA, to fashion; and, in this sense, and with the same accent as the Greek μήτηρ, mâ'tar, not yet determined by a feminine affix, is used in the *Veda* as a masculine. Thus, we read for instance, *Rv.* VIII. 41, 4,

Sáh mâ'tâ pûrvyám padám
'He, Varu*n*a (Uranos) is the maker of the old place.' (= I, 61, 7)

Now, it should be observed, that mâtar, as well as pitar, is but one out of many names by which the idea of father and mother might have been expressed. Even if we confined ourselves to the root PA, and took the granting of support to his offspring as the most characteristic attribute of father, many words might have been, and actually were, formed, all equally fit to become, so to say, the proper name of father. In Sanskrit protector can be expressed not only by PA, followed by the derivative suffix tar, but by pâ-la, pâ-laka, pâ-yú, all meaning protector. Now, the fact, that out of many possible forms, *one* only has been admitted into all the Arian dictionaries, shows that there must have been something like a traditional usage in language long before the separation of the Arian family took place. Besides, there were other roots from which the name of father might have been formed, such as GAN, from which we have *g*anitár, genitor, γενετήρ; or TAK, from which the Greek τοκεύς; or PAR, from which the Latin parens; not to mention many other names equally applicable to express some prominent attribute of a father in his relation to his children. If each Arian dialect had formed its own name for father, from one of the many roots which all the Arian dialects share in common, we should be able to say that there was a radical community between all these languages; but we should never succeed in proving, what is most essential—their historical community, or their divergence from one language which had already acquired a decided idiomatical consistency.

It happens, however, even with these, the most essential terms of an incipient civilization, that one or the other of the Arian dialects has lost the ancient expression, and replaced

it by a new one. The common Arian names for brother and sister, for instance, do not occur in Greek, where brother and sister are called ἀδελφός and ἀδελφή. To conclude from this that at the time when the Greeks started from their Arian home, the names of brother and sister had not yet been framed, would be a mistake. We have no reason to suppose that the Greeks were the first to leave, and, if we find that nations like the Teutonic or Celtic, who could have had no contact with the natives of India after the first separation had taken place, yet share the name of brother in common with Sanskrit, it is as certain that this name existed in the primitive Arian language, as the occurrence of the same word in Wallachian and Portuguese would prove its Latin origin, though no trace of it existed in any of the other Romance dialects. No doubt, the growth of language is governed by immutable laws, but the influence of accident is more considerable here than in any other branch of natural science; and, though in this case it is possible to find a principle which determines the accidental loss* of the ancient names for brother and sister in Greek, yet this is not the case always, and we shall frequently find that one or the other Arian dialect does not exhibit a term which yet, on the strength of our general argument, we shall feel justified in ascribing to the most ancient period of Arian speech.

The mutual relation between brother and sister had been hallowed at that early period, and it had been sanctioned by names which had become traditional before the Arian family broke up into different colonies. The original meaning of bhrâtar seems to have been he who carries or assists; of svasar, she who pleases or consoles—svasti meaning in Sanskrit joy or happiness.

In duhitar, again, we find a name which must have become traditional long before the separation took place. It is a name identically the same in all the dialects, except Latin, and yet Sanskrit alone could have preserved a consciousness of its appellative power. Duhitar, as Professor Lassen has shown, is derived from DUH, a root, which in Sanskrit means, to milk. It is perhaps the Latin dūco, and the transition of meaning would be the same as between trahere, to draw, and traire, to milk. Now, the name of milkmaid, given to the daughter of the house, opens before our eyes a little idyll of the poetical and pastoral life of the early Arians. One of the few things by which the daughter, before she was married, might make herself useful in a nomadic household, was the milking of the cattle, and it discloses a kind of delicacy and humour, even in

* See *Edinburgh Review*, Oct. 1851, p. 320.

the rudest state of society, if we imagine a father calling his daughter his little milkmaid, rather than sutâ, his begotten, or filia, the suckling. This meaning, however, must have been forgotten long before the Arians separated. Duhitar was then no longer a nickname, but it had become a technical term, or so to say, the proper name of daughter. That many words were formed in the same spirit, and that they were applicable only during a nomadic state of life, we shall have frequent opportunity of seeing, as we go on. But as the transition of words of such special meaning into general terms, deprived of all etymological vitality, may seem strange, we may as well give at once a few analogous cases where, behind expressions of the most general currency, we can discover, by means of etymology, this peculiar background of the ancient nomad life of the Arian nations. The very word *peculiar* may serve as an illustration taken from more modern times. Peculiar, now means singular, extraordinary, but originally it meant what was private, *i.e.* not common, property; being derived from peculium. Now, the Latin peculium stands for pecudium (like consilium for considium), and being derived from pecus, pecudis, it expressed originally what we should call cattle and chattle. Cattle constituting the chief personal property of agricultural people, we may well understand how peculiar, meaning originally what refers to one's own property, came to mean not-common, and at last, in our modern conversation, passed into the meaning of strange. I need hardly mention the well-known etymology of pecunia, which being derived from the same word, pecu, and therefore signifying flocks, took gradually the meaning of money, in the same manner as the Anglo-Saxon feoh, the German Vieh, cattle (and originally, according to Grimm's law, the same word as pecu), received in the course of time the sense of a pecuniary remuneration, a fee. What takes place in modern languages, and, as it were, under our own eyes, must not surprise us in more distant ages. Now, the most useful cattle have always been the ox and the cow, and they seem to have constituted the chief riches and the most important means of subsistence among the Arian nations. Ox and cow are called in Sanskrit go, plur. gâvas, which is the same word as the Old High German chuo, pl. chuowi, and with a change from the guttural to the labial media, the classical *βοῦς*, *βόες*, and bôs, bóves. The Slavonic languages also have preserved traces of this ancient name; for instance, the Lettish gohws, the Slavon. govyado, a herd, Serv. govedar, a cow-herd. From *βοῦς* we have in Greek *βουκόλος*, which meant originally a cow-herd, but in the verb *βουκολέω*, the meaning of tending cows has been absorbed by the more

general one of tending cattle, nay, it is used in a metaphorical sense, such as ἐλπίσι βουκολοῦμαι, I feed myself on vain hopes. It is used with regard to horses, and thus we find for horse-herd, ἱππο βούκολος, originally a cow-herd of horses,—an expression which we can only compare with Sanskrit goyuga, meaning a yoke of oxen, but afterwards any pair, so that a pair of oxen would be called go-go-yuga. Thus, in Sanskrit, go-pa means originally a cow-herd, but it soon loses this specific meaning, and is used for the head of a cow-pen, a herdsman, and at last, like the Greek ποιμῆν λαῶν, for a king. From gopa a new verb is formed, gopayati, and in it all traces of its original meaning are obliterated; it means simply to protect. As gopa meant a cow-herd, go-tra, in Sanskrit, was originally a hurdle, and meant the enclosure by which a herd was protected against thieves, and kept from straying. Gotra, however, has almost entirely lost its etymological power in the later Sanskrit, where the feminine only, gotrâ, preserves the meaning of a herd of kine. In ancient times, when most wars were carried on, not to maintain the political equilibrium of Asia or Europe, but to take possession of good pasture, or to appropriate large herds of cattle,* the hurdles grew naturally into the walls of fortresses, the hedges became strongholds, and those who lived behind the same walls were called a gotra, a family, a tribe, a race. In the *Veda*, gotra is still used in the sense of folds or hurdles, (iii. 39, 4).

Nâkir êshâm ninditâ' mártyeshu
Yé asmâ'kam pitára*h* góshu yodhâ'*h*
I'ndra*h* eshâm dri*n*hitâ' mâ'hinâvân
Ût gotrâ'*n*i sasri*g*e dan*s*ánâvân.

'Not is there among men one scoffing at them who were our fathers, who fought among the cows. Indra, the mighty, is their defender; he, the powerful, spread out their hurdles,* *i. e.* their possessions.'

'Fighting among or for the cows,' goshu-yúdh, is used in the *Veda* as a name for warrior, in general, i. 112, 22, and one of the most frequent words for battle is gáv-ish*ti*, literally 'striving for cows.' In the later Sanskrit, however, gavesha*n*a means simply, research (physical or philosophical), gavesh, to inquire. Again, gosht*h*a means cow-pen or stable

* ὑπὲρ νομῆς ἢ λείας μαχόμεθα. *Toxar.* 36. Grimm, *Hist. of the German Language*, p. 17.

* Hurdle seems to be the Vaidik *Kh*ardis, house, *i.e.* enclosure, and from the same root we have Anglo-Saxon heord, a herd, and Old Norse hirdr, bene custoditus. Perhaps Latin cors, cortis (cohors, cohortis) comes from the same source, meaning an enclosed ground, a court, and at last a palace.

(βούσταθμον), but, with the progress of time and civilization goshthî became the name of an assembly, nay, it was used to express discussion and gossip, as gossip also meant originally a godfather or godmother, and then took the abstract sense of idle conversation or tattle.

All these words, composed with go, cattle, to which many more might have been added if we were not afraid of trying the patience of our less sceptical readers, prove that the people who formed them must have led a half nomadic and pastoral life, and we may well understand how the same people came to use duhitar in the sense of daughter. Language has been called a map of the science and manners of the people who speak it, and we should probably find, if we examined the language of a maritime people, that instead of cattle and pasture, ships and water would form part of many words which afterwards took a more general meaning.

We proceed to examine other terms which indicate the state of society previous to the separation of the Arian race, and which we hope will give to our distant picture that expression of truth and reality which can be appreciated even by those who have never seen the original.

We pass over the words for son, partly because their etymology is of no interest, their meaning being simply that of natus, born,* partly because the position of the son, or the successor and inheritor of his father's wealth and power, would claim a name at a much earlier time than daughter, sister, or brother. All these relations in fact, expressed by *father* and *mother*, *son* and *daughter*, *brother* and *sister*, are fixed, we should say, by the laws of nature, and their acknowledgment in language would not prove any considerable advance in civilization, however appropriately the names themselves might have been chosen. But there are other relations, of later origin, and of a more conventional character, sanctioned, it is true, by the laws of society, but not proclaimed by the voice of nature,—relations which are aptly expressed in English by the addition of in-law, as father-in-law, mother, son, daughter, brother and sister-in-law. If the names for these relations could be vindicated for the earliest period of Arian civilization, we should have gained something considerable, for though there is hardly a dialect in Africa or Australia in which we do not find words for father, mother,

* For instance,—Sk. sûnú, Goth. sunus, Lith. sunus, all from su, to beget, whence Greek *υἱός*, but by a different suffix. Sansk. putra, son, is of doubtful origin, but probably of considerable antiquity, as it is shared by the Celtic branch, (Brit. paotr.) The Lat. puer is supposed to be derived from the same root.

son, daughter, brother, and sister, and hardly a tribe in which these natural degrees of relationship are not hallowed, there are languages in which the degrees of affinity have never received expression, and tribes who ignore their very meaning.

	Sanskrit.	Greek.	Latin.	Gothic.	Slav.	Celtic.
Father-in-law:	*svásura*	*ἑκυρός*	socer	svaihra.	svekr	chwegrwn
Mother-in-law:	*svasrû*	*ἑκυρά*	socrus	svaihro	svekrvj	W. chwegyr
Son-in-law:	*gâ'mâtar*	*γαμβρός*	gener	...	...	...
Daughter-in-law:	snushâ	*νυός*	nurus	snûr	snocha	...
Brother-in-law:	dêvár (*ανδράδελφος*)	*δαήρ*	levir	tâcor	L. deweris	...
Sister-in-law:	(nânandar)	*γάλως* (*ἀνδραδέλφη*)	glos	...	...	...
	yâtaras (wives of brothers) ...	*εἰνάτερες*	janitrices	...	P. jatrew	...
	syálá (wife's brother) ...	*ἀέλιοι* and	...	...	...	...
	syâlî (wife's sister)	*εἰλιόνες* (husbands of sisters)	...	...	...	...

The above table shows that, before the separation of the Arian race, every one of the degrees of affinity had received expression and sanction in language; for, although some spaces had to be left empty, the coincidences, such as they are, are sufficient to warrant one general conclusion. If we find in Sanskrit the word putra, son, and in Celtic, again, paotr, son, root and suffix being the same, we must remember that, although none of the other Arian dialects has preserved this word in exactly the same form, yet the identity of the Celtic and Sanskrit term can only be explained on the supposition that putra was a common Arian term, well known before any branch of this family was severed from the common stem.

In modern languages we might, if dealing with similar cases, feel inclined to admit a later communication, but fortunately, in ancient languages, no such intercourse was possible, after the southern branch of the Arian family had once crossed the Himâlaya, and the northern branch set foot on the shores of Europe. Different questions are raised where, as is the case with *g*âmâtar and *γαμβρός*, originally bridegroom or husband,* then son-in-law, we are only able to prove that the same root was taken, and therefore the same radical idea expressed by Greek and Sanskrit, while the derivation is peculiar in each language. Here no doubt we must be more careful in our conclusions, but generally, we shall find that these formal differences are only such as occur in dialects of the same language, when out of many possible forms, used at first promiscuously, one was chosen by one poet, one by another, and then became popular and traditional. This at least is more likely than to suppose that

* *γαμβρὸς καλεῖται ὁ γήμας ὑπὸ τῶν οἰκείων τῆς γαμηθείσης.*

to express a relation which might be expressed in such various ways, the Greek should have chosen the same root *γαμ* to form *γαμρὸς* and *γαμβρός*, independently of the Hindu, who took the same root for the same purpose, only giving it a casual form (as in bhrâtar instead of bhartar), and appending to it the usual suffix, tar; thus forming *gâ'*mâ-tar, instead of *g*amara or yamara. Again, when it happens that one of these languages has lost a common term, we are sometimes enabled to prove its former existence by means of derivatives. In Greek, for instance, at least in the literary language, there is no trace of nepos, grandson, which we have in Sanskrit nápât, Germ. nefo; nor of neptis, Sk. naptî, Germ. nift. Yet there is in Greek *ἀ-νεψιός*, a first-cousin, *i.e.* one with whom we are grandsons together, as the uncle is called the little-grandfather, avunculus from avus. This word *ἀνεψιός* is formed like Latin consobrinus, *i.e.* consororinus, one with whom we are sister-children, our modern cousin, It. cugino, in which there remains very little of the original word soror, from which however it is derived. *'Α-νεψιός* therefore proves that in Greek also, *νεπους* must have existed in the sense of child or grandchild, and it is by a similar process that we can prove the former presence in Greek of a term corresponding to Sk. syâla, a wife's brother. In Sanskrit a husband calls his wife's brother syâla, his wife's sister syâlî. Therefore, in Greek Peleus would call Amphitrite, and Poseidon Thetis, their syâlîs: having married sisters, they would have syâlîs in common,—they would be what the Greeks call *ἀ-έλιοι*, for sy between two vowels is generally dropped in Greek; and the only anomaly consists in the short ε representing the long â in Sanskrit.

There are still a few words which throw a dim light on the early organisation of the Arian family life. The position of the widow was acknowledged in language and in law, and we find no trace that, at that early period, she who had lost her husband was doomed to die with him. If this custom had existed, the want of having a name for widow would hardly have been felt, or, if it had been, the word would most likely have had some reference to this awful rite. Now, husband, or man, in Sanskrit is dhava, a word which does not seem to exist in the other Arian languages, except perhaps in Celtic, where Pictet brings forward the analogous form, dea, a man or person. From dhava, Sanskrit forms the name of the widow by the addition of the preposition vi, which means without; therefore vidhavâ, husbandless, widow. This compound has been preserved in languages which have lost the simple word dhava, thus showing the great antiquity of this traditional term. We have it not only in

Celtic feadbh, but in Gothic viduvo, Slav. vdova, Old Prussian widdewû, and Latin vidua. If the custom of widow-burning had existed at that early period, there would have been no vidhavâs, no husbandless women, because they would all have followed their husband into death. Therefore the very name indicates what we are further enabled to prove by historical evidence, the late origin of widow-burning in India. It is true, that when the English Government prohibited this melancholy custom, and when the whole of India seemed on the verge of a religious revolution, the Brahmans appealed to the *Veda* as the authority for this sacred rite, and as they had the promise that their religious practices should not be interfered with, they claimed respect for the Suttee. They actually quoted chapter and verse from the *Rigveda*, and Colebrooke,* the most accurate and learned Sanskrit scholar we have ever had, has translated this passage in accordance with their views :

'Om ! let these women, not to be widowed, good wives adorned with collyrium, holding clarified butter, consign themselves to the fire ! Immortal, not childless, not husbandless, well adorned with gems, let them pass into the fire, whose original element is water.' (From the *Rigveda.*)

Now this is perhaps the most flagrant instance of what can be done by an unscrupulous priesthood. Here have thousands and thousands of lives been sacrificed, and a fanatical rebellion been threatened on the authority of a passage which was mangled, mistranslated, and misapplied. If anybody had been able at the time to verify this verse of the *Rigveda*, the Brahmans might have been beaten with their own weapons; nay their spiritual prestige might have been considerably shaken. The *Rigveda*, which now hardly one Brahman out of a hundred is able to read, so far from enforcing the burning of widows, shows clearly that this custom was not sanctioned during the earliest period of Indian history. According to the hymns of the *Rigveda* and the Vaidik ceremonial, contained in the Grihyasûtras the wife accompanies the corpse of her husband to the funeral pile, but she is there addressed with a verse taken from the *Rigveda*, and ordered to leave her husband, and to return to the world of the living.† 'Rise up, woman,' it is said, 'come to the world of life; thou sleepest nigh unto him whose life is gone. Come to us. Thou hast

* On the Duties of a faithful Widow, *Asiatic Researches*, vol. iv. pp. 209, 219. Calcutta, 1795.

† See Grimm's Essay on *The Burning of the Dead;* Roth's article on *The Burial in India;* Professor Wilson's article on *The supposed Vaidik authority for the burning of Hindu Widows*, and my own translation

thus fulfilled thy duties of a wife to the husband who once took thy hand, and made thee mother.'

This verse is preceded by the very verse which the later Brahmans have falsified and quoted in support of their cruel tenet. The reading of the verse is beyond all doubt, for there is no various reading, in our sense of the word, in the whole of the *Rigveda*. Besides, we have the commentaries and the ceremonials, and nowhere is there any difference as to the text or its meaning. It is addressed to the other women who are present at the funeral, and who have to pour oil and butter on the pile.

'May these women who are not widows, but have good husbands, draw near with oil and butter. Those who are mothers may go up first to the altar, without tears, without sorrow, but decked with fine jewels.'

Now the words 'the mothers may go first to the altar,' are in Sanskrit,

'Â rohantu *g*anayo yonim agre;'

and this the Brahmans have changed into

'Â rohantu *g*anayo yonim agne*h*;'

—a small change, but sufficient to consign many lives to the womb (yonim) of fire (agne*h*.)*

After this digression, we return to the earlier period of history of which language alone can give us any information, and, as we have claimed for it the name of widow, or the husbandless, we need not wonder that the name for husband also is the same to this day in most of the Arian languages, which had been fixed upon by the Arians before their separation. It is pati in Sanskrit, meaning originally strong, like Latin potis or potens. In Lithuanian the form is exactly the same, patis, and this, if we apply Grimm's law, becomes faths in Gothic. In Greek again we find πόσις instead of πότις. Now, the feminine of pati in Sanskrit is patnî, and there is no doubt that the Old Prussian pattin, in the accusative waispattin, and the Greek πότνια are mere transcripts of it, all meaning the mistress.

---

of the complete documentary evidence in the *Journal of the German Oriental Society*, vol. ix. fasc. 4. Professor Wilson was the first to point out the falsification of the text, and the change of 'yonim agre' into 'yonim agne*h*.'

* In a similar manner the custom of widow-burning has been introduced by the Brahmans in an interpolated passage of the *Toy-Cart*, an Indian drama of King Sudraka, which was translated by Prof. Wilson, and has lately been performed at Paris. *Le Chariot d'Enfant*, Drame en vers en cinq actes et sept tableaux, traduction du Drame Indien du Roi Soudraka, par MM. Méry et Gerard de Nerval. Paris, 1850.

What the husband was in his house, the lord, the strong protector—the king was among his people. Now, a common name for people was *vis* in Sanskrit, from which the title of the third caste, the householders, or Vaisyas is derived. It comes from the same root from which we have in Sanskrit *vesa*, house, οἶκος, vicus, Goth. veihs, German wich, and the modern English termination of many names of places. Hence *vispati* in Sanskrit meant king, *i.e.* lord of the people, and that this compound had become a title sanctioned by Arian etiquette before the separation, is confirmed in a strange manner by the Lithuanian wiêsz-patis, a lord, wiesz-patene, a lady, as compared with the Sanskrit *vis*-patis and patnî. There was therefore, at that early period, not only a nicely-organised family life, but the family began to become absorbed by the state, and here again conventional titles had been fixed, and were handed down perhaps two thousand years before the title of Cæsar was heard of.

Another name for people being dâsa or dasyu, dâsa-pati no doubt was an ancient name for king. There is, however, this great difference between *vis* and dâsa, that the former means people, the latter subjects, conquered races, nay originally, enemies. Dasyu in the *Veda* is enemy, but in the *Zendavesta*, where we have the same word, it means provinces or gentes; and Darius calls himself, in his Mountain-records, 'King of Persia and King of the provinces, (Kshâyathîya Pârsaiya, Kshâyathîya dahyunâm). Hence it is hardly doubtful that the Greek δεσ-πότης represents a Sanskrit title dâsa pati, lord of nations; but we cannot admit that the title of Hospodar, which has lately become so notorious, should, as Bopp says, be the same as Sanskrit vispati, or as dâsapati. The word is gaspadorus in Lithuanian; in Old Slav. gospod, gospodin, and gospodar; Pol. gospodarz; Boh. hospodár. A Slavonic g, however, does not correspond to Sanskrit w or d, nor could the t of pati become d.* Benfey, who derives gospod from the Vaidik *gâspati*, avoids the former, but not the latter difficulty, and it is certainly better to state these difficulties than to endeavour to smuggle in some ancient Arian terms, in defiance of laws which can never be violated with impunity.

A third common Arian word for king is *râg*, in the *Veda;* rex, regis, in Latin; reiks in Gothic, a word still used in German, as reich, regnum, Frank-reich, regnum Francorum; and Irish riogh; Welsh ri.

A fourth name for king and queen is simply father and

---

* See Schleicher's excellent remarks in his *Formenlehre der Kirchenslawischen Sprache*, 1852, p. 107.

mother. *G*anaka in Sanskrit means father, from GAN, to beget; it also occurs, as the name of a well-known king, in the *Veda*. This is the Old German chuning, the English king. Mother in Sanskrit is *g*ani, the Greek γυνή, the Gothic qinô, the Slav. *z*ena, the English queen. *Queen*, therefore, means originally mother, or lady; and thus again we see how the language of the family life grew gradually into the political language of the oldest Arian state, and how the brotherhood of the family became the φρατρια of the state.

We have seen that the name of house was known before the Arian family broke up towards the south and the north, and we might bring further evidence to this effect by comparing Sk. dama, with Greek δόμος, Lat. domus, Slav. domü, Celt. daimh, and Goth. timrjan, to build, from which English timber, though we doubt the identity of the Slavonic grod and gorod, the Lithuanian grod, with the Gothic gards, Lat. hort-us, Greek χόρτος, all meaning an enclosed ground. The most essential part of a house, particularly in ancient times, being a door well fastened and able to resist the attacks of enemies; we are glad to find the ancient name preserved in Sanskrit, dvar, dvâras, Goth. daur, Lith. durrys, Celt. dor, Greek θύρα, Lat. fores. The builder also, or architect, has the same name in Sanskrit and Greek, takshan being the Greek τέκτων. The Greek ἄστυ, again, has been compared with Sk. vâstu, house; the Greek κώμη, with Gothic haims, a village; the English home. Still more conclusive as to the early existence of cities, is the Sk. puri, town, preserved by the Greeks in their name for town, πόλις; and that highroads also were not unknown, appears from Sanskrit path, pathi, panthan, and pâthas, all names for path, the Greek πάτος, the Gothic fad, which Bopp believes to be identical with Lat. pons, pontis, and Slav. ponti.

It would take a volume were we to examine all the relics of language, though, no doubt, every new word would strengthen our argument, and add, as it were, a new stone from which this ancient and venerable ruin of the Arian mind might be reconstructed. The evidence, however, which we have gone through must be sufficient to show that the race of men which could coin these words—words that have been carried down the stream of time, and washed up on the shores of so many nations, could not have been a race of savages, of mere nomads and hunters. Nay, it should be observed, that most of the terms connected with chase and warfare differ in each of the Arian dialects, while words connected with more peaceful occupations, belong generally to the common heir-loom of the Arian language. The proper appreciation of this fact in its

general bearing will show how a similar remark made by Niebuhr with regard to Greek and Latin, requires a very different explanation from that which that great scholar, from his more restricted point of view, was able to give it. It will show that all the Arian nations had led a long life of peace before they separated, and that their language acquired individuality and nationality, as each colony started in search of new homes,—new generations forming new terms connected with the warlike and adventurous life of their onward migrations. Hence it is that not only Greek and Latin, but all Arian languages have their peaceful words in common; and hence it is that they all differ so strangely in their warlike expressions. Thus the domestic animals are generally known by the same name in England and in India, while the wild beasts have different names, even in Greek and Latin. I can only give a list, which must tell its own story, for it would take too much time to enter into the etymological formation of all these words, though no doubt a proper understanding of their radical meaning would make them more instructive as living witnesses to the world of thought and the primitive household of the Arian race.

	Sanskrit and Zend.	Greek.	Italian.	Teutonic.	Lithuanian.	Slav.	Celtic.
Cattle:	paśu	πῶυ	pecu	G. faihu O.H.G. fihu	Pruss. pecku	...	...
Ox and cow:	go (nom. gaus)...	βοῦς	bos	O.H.G. chuo	Lett. gohw	Slav. govjado	...
Ox:	ukshan ukhshan vakhsha	...	vacca?	G. auhsan	...	...	W. ych
Steer:	sthûrá	ταῦρος	taurus	stiur	...	tour	...
Heifer:	stari ...	στειρα	(sterilis)	stairo	...	...	...
Horse:	âśu, aśva	ἵππος	equus	G. aihus	aszwa	...	W. osw
Foal:	... ...	πῶλος	pullus	G. fula	...	...	...
Dog:	śvan	σπâ (σπάκα)	κύων	canis	O.H.G. hund	szů	R. sobaka Bulg. kuce	G. cu
Sheep:	avi ...	ὄϊς	ovis	G. avi-str E. ewe	awi	Slav. ovjza	...
Calf:	vatsa ...	ἴταλος	vitulus	...	...	...	...
He-goat:	... ...	κάπρος	caper	O.H.G. hafr	...	...	...
She-goat:	agâ ...	αἶξ ...	...	ozis	...		G. aighe
Sow:	sû (kara) ...	ὗς	sus	O.H.G. sû	...	svinia	...
Pig:	prishat ...	πόρκος	porcus	O.H.G. farah	parszas	Pol. prosie	...
Hog:	grishvi ...	χοῖρος ...		O.N. gris	...	...	...
Donkey:	... ...	ὄνος	asinus	asilo	...	...	...
Mouse:	mûsh ...	μῦς	mus	O.H.G. mûs	...	Pol. mysz	...
Fly:	makshikâ ...	μυῖα	musca	O.H.G. micco	musse	R. mucha	...
Goose:	hansa ...	χήν	anser	O.H.S. kans	zasis	Boh. hus	G. ganra

Of wild animals some were known to the Arians before they separated, and they happen to be animals which live both in Asia and Europe, the bear and the wolf.

	Sanskrit.	Greek.	Italian.	Teutonic.	Slavonic.
Bear:	ṛiksha	ἄρκτος	ursus		
Wolf:	vṛika	λύκος	lupus (v)irpus	vulfs	wilka

To them should be added the serpent.

Serpent:	ahi	ἔχις (ἔγχελυς)	anguis (anguilla)	ungury	R. ûgorj
	sarpa	ἕρπετον	serpens		

Without dwelling on the various names of those animals which had partly been tamed and domesticated, while others were then, as they are now, the natural enemies of the shepherd and his flocks, we proceed at once to mention a few words which indicate that this early pastoral life was not without some of the most primitive arts, such as ploughing, grinding, weaving, and the working of precious and useful metals.

The oldest term for ploughing is AR, which we find in Lat. arare, Greek *ἀροῦν*, Old High German aran, to ear, Russ. orati, Lithuanian arti, and Gaelic ar. From this verb we have the common name of the plough, *ἄροτρον*, aratrum, Old Saxon erida, Old Norse ardhr, Slavonic oralo and oradlo, Lith. arimnas, and Corn. aradar. *Ἄρουρα* and arvum come probably from the same root. But a more general name for field is Sk. pada, Greek *πέδον*, Umbrian perum, Pol. pole, Saxon folda, O.H.G. feld, field; or *ἀγρός*, ager, and Goth. akrs.

The corn which was grown in Asia could not well have been the same which the Arian nations afterwards cultivated in more northern regions. Some of the names, however, have been preserved, and may be supposed to have had, if not exactly the same, at least a similar botanical character. Such are Sk. yava, Zend. yava, Lithuanian jawas, which in Greek must be changed to *ζέα*. Sk. *s*veta means white, and corresponds to Gothic hveit O.H.G. huiz, and wiz, the Anglo-Saxon hvît, and Lithuanian kwêtys. But the name of the colour became also the name of the white grain, and thus we have Gothic hvaitei, Lith. kwec'io, the English wheat, with which some scholars have compared the Slav. shito, and the Greek *σῖτος*. The name of corn signified originally what is crushed or ground. Thus *Kûrn*a in Sanskrit means ground, and from the same radical element we must no doubt derive the Russian zerno, the Goth. kaurn, the Latin granum. In Lithuanian, girna is a mill-stone, and the plural girnôs is the name of a hand-mill. The Russian word for mill-stone is, again, shernov, and the Gothic name for mill, qvairnus, the later quirn. The English name for mill is likewise of considerable antiquity, for it exists not only in the O.H.G. muli, but in the Lithuanian malunas, the Bohemian mlyn, the Welsh melin, the Latin mola, and the Greek *μύλη*.

We might add the names for cooking and baking, and the early distinction between flesh and meat, to show that the same aversion which is expressed in later times, for instance, by the poets of the *Veda*, against tribes eating raw flesh, was felt already during this primitive period. Kravya-ad (*κρέας-ἐδω*) and âma-ad (*ὠμός-ἐδω*) are names applied to barbarians, and used with the same horror in India as *ὠμοφάγοι* and

κρεωφάγοι in Greece. But we can only now touch on these points, and must leave it to another opportunity to bring out in full relief this old picture of human life.

As the name for clothes is the same among all the Arian nations, being vastra in Sanskrit, vasti in Gothic, vestis in Latin, ἑσθής in Greek, gwisk in Celtic, we are justified in ascribing to the Arian ancestors the art of weaving as well as of sowing. To weave in Sanskrit is ve, and, in a causative form, vap. With ve coincide the Latin vieo, and the Greek radical in Fή-τριον; with vap, the O.H.G. wab, the English weave, the Greek ὑφ-αίνω.

To sew, in Sanskrit, is siv, from which sûtra, a thread. The same root is preserved in Latin suo, in Gothic siuja, in O.H.G. siwu, the English to sew, Lithuanian suwú, Slav. shivu, Greek κασσύω for κατασύω. Another Sanskrit root, with a very similar meaning, is NAH, which must have existed also as nabh and nadh. From nah we have Latin neo and necto, Greek νέω, German nâhan, and nâvan, to sew; from nadh, the Greek νήθω; from nabh, the Sanskrit nâbhi, and nâbha or ûrnanâbha, the spider, literally the wool-spinner.

There is a fourth root which seems to have had originally the special meaning of sewing or weaving, but which afterwards took in Sanskrit the more general sense of making. This is rak, which may correspond to the Greek ῥάπτω, to stitch together, or to weave; nay, which might account for another name of the spider, ἀράχνη in Greek, and aranea in Latin, and for the classical name of woven wool, λάχνος or λάχνη, and the Latin lana.

That the value and usefulness of some of the metals was known before the separation of the Arian race, can be proved only by a few words; for the names of most of the metals differ in different countries. Yet there can be no doubt that iron was known, and its value appreciated, whether for defence or for attack. Whatever its old Arian name may have been, it is clear that Sanskrit ayas, Latin ahes in aheneus, and even the contracted form aes, aeris, the Gothic ais, the Old High German er, and the English iron, are names cast in the same mould, and only slightly corroded even now by the rust of so many centuries. The names of the precious metals, such as gold and silver, have suffered more in passing through the hands of so many generations. But, notwithstanding, we are able to discover even in the Celtic airgiod the traces of the Sanskrit rajata, the Greek ἄργυρος, the Latin argentum; and even in the Gothic gulþ, gold, a similarity has been detected with the Slavonic zlato and Russian zoloto, Greek χρύσος and Sanskrit hiranyam, only that the terminations differ widely.

The radical seems to have been harat, from whence the Sanskrit harit, the colour of the sun and of the dawn, as aurum also descends from the same root with aurora. Some of the iron implements used, whether for peaceful or warlike purposes, have kept their original name, and it is curious to find the exact similarity of the Sanskrit parasu, and the Greek πέλεκυς, axe, or of Sanskrit asi, sword, and Latin ensis.

New ideas do not gain ground at once, and there is a tendency in our mind to resist new convictions as long as we can. Hence it is only by a gradual and careful accumulation of facts that we can hope to establish on this linguistic evidence the reality of a period in the history of mankind previous to the beginning of the most ancient known dialects of the Arian world,—previous to the origin of Sanskrit as well as Greek,—previous to the time when the first Greek arrived on the shores of Asia Minor, and looking at the vast expanse of sea and country to the west and north, called it *Europa*. Let us examine one other witness, whose negative evidence will be important. During this early period, the ancestors of the Arian race must have occupied a more central position in Asia, whence the southern branches extended towards India, the northern to Asia Minor and Europe. It would follow, therefore, that before their separation, they could not have known the existence of the sea, and hence, if our theory be true, the name for sea must be of later growth, and different in the Arian languages. And this expectation is fully confirmed. We find, indeed, identical names in Greek and Latin, but not in the northern and southern branches of the Arian family. And even these Greek and Latin names are evidently metaphorical expressions,—names that existed in the ancient language, and were transferred to this new phenomenon. Pontus and πόντος mean sea in the same sense as Homer speaks of ὑγρὰ κέλευθα, for pontus comes from the same source from which we have pons, pontis, and the Sanskrit pantha, if not pâthas. The sea was not called a barrier, but a high-road—more useful for trade and travel than any other road—and Prof. Curtius* has well pointed out Greek expressions, such as πόντος ἁλὸς πολιῆς, and θάλασσα πόντου, as indicating, even among the Greeks, a consciousness of the original import of πόντος. Nor can words like Sanskrit salila, Latin sal, and Greek ἅλς, ἁλός, be quoted as proving an acquaintance with the sea among the early Arians. They may have known the use of

* See Kuhn's *Journal of Comparative Philology*, i. 34. Prof. Curtius gives the equation: πόντος : πάτος = πένθος : πάθος = βένθος : βάθος.

salt, but this is all that could be proved by ἅλς, sal, and salila; the application of these words to the sea belongs to later times. The same remark applies to words like aequor in Latin, or πέλαγος in Greek. Θάλασσα has long been proved to be a dialectical form of θάρασσα or τάρασσα, expressing the troubled waves of the sea (ἐτάραξε δὲ πόντον Ποσειδῶν), and if the Latin mare be the same as Sanskrit vâri, vâri in Sanskrit does not mean sea, but water in general, and could, therefore, only confirm the fact that all the Arian nations applied terms of a general meaning when they had each to fix their names for the sea. But mare is more likely a name for dead or stagnant water, like Sanskrit maru, the desert, derived from mṛi, to die; and though it is identical with Gothic marei, Slav. more, Irish muir, the application of all these words to the ocean is of later date. But, although the sea had not yet been reached by the Arian nations before their common language branched off into various dialects, navigation was well known to them. The words oar and rudder can be traced back to Sanskrit, and the name of the ship is identically the same in Sanskrit (naus, nâvas), in Latin (navis), in Greek (ναῦς), and in Teutonic (Old High German nacho, A.S. naca.)

It is hardly possible to look at the evidence hitherto collected, and which, if space allowed, might have been considerably increased,* without feeling that these words are the fragments of a real language, once spoken by a united race at a time which the historian has till lately hardly ventured to realize, except on the authority of the sacred writings of the Jews. Yet here we have in our own hands, the relics of that distant time; we are using the same words which were used by the fathers of the Arian race, changed only by phonetic influences; nay, we are as near to them in thought and speech as the French and Italians are to the ancient people of Rome. If any more proof was wanted as to the reality of that period which must have preceded the dispersion of the Arian race, we might appeal to the Arian numerals, as irrefragable evidence of that long-continued intellectual life which characterizes that period. Here is a decimal system of numeration, perhaps one of the most marvellous achievements of the human mind, based on an abstract conception of quantity, regulated by a spirit of philosophical classifica-

* A large collection of common Arian words is found in Grimm's History of the German Language. The first attempt to use them for historical purposes was made by Eichhof; but the most useful contributions have since been made by Winning in his *Manual of Comparative Philology*, 1838; by Kuhn, Curtius, and Förstemann, and much new material is to be found in Bopp's *Glossary* and Pott's *Etymologische Forschungen*.

tion, and yet conceived, matured, and finished before the soil of Europe was trodden by Greek, Roman, Slave, or Teuton. Such a system could only have been formed by a very small community, and more than any part of language it seems to necessitate the admission of a conventional agreement among those who first framed and adopted the Arian names for one to hundred. Let us imagine as well as we can, that at the present moment, we were suddenly called upon to invent new names for one, two, three, and we may then begin to feel what kind of task it was to form and fix these names. We could easily supply new expressions for material objects, because they always have some attributes which language can render either metaphorically or periphrastically. We could call the sea the salt water, the rain, the water of heaven, the rivers, the daughters of the earth. Numbers, however, are, by their very nature, such abstract and empty conceptions, that it tries our ingenuity to the utmost to find any attributive element in them to which expression might be given, and which might in time become the proper name of a merely quantitative idea. There might be less difficulty for one and two; and hence, these two numerals have received more than one name in the Arian family. But this again would only create a new difficulty, because, if different people were allowed to use different names for the same numeral, the very object of these names would be defeated. If five could be expressed by a term meaning the open hand, and might also be rendered by the simple plural of fingers, these two synonymous terms would be useless for the purpose of any exchange of thought. Again, if a word meaning fingers or toes might have been used to express five as well as ten, all commerce between individuals using the same word in different senses, would have been rendered impossible. Hence, in order to form and fix a series of words expressing one, two, three, four, &c., it was necessary that the ancestors of the Arian race should have come to a formal agreement to use but one term for each number, and to attach but one meaning to each term. This was not the case with regard to other words, as may be seen by the large proportion of synonymous and polyonymous terms by which every ancient language is characterized,—the wear and tear of language in literary and practical usage being alone able to reduce the exuberance of this early growth, and to give to each object but one name, and to each name but one power. And all this must have been achieved with regard to the Arian numerals before Greek was Greek, for thus only can we account for the coincidences as exhibited in the subjoined table:—

	Sanskrit.	Greek.	Latin.	Lithuanian.	Gothic.
I.	ekas	εἷς (οἴνη)	unus	wienas	ains
II.	dvau	δύω	duo	du	tvai
III.	trayas	τρεῖς	tres	trys	threis
IV.	katvâras]	τέτταρες (Aed., πισυρες)	quatuor (Oscan, petora)	keturi	fidvôr
V.	panka	πέντε	quinque (Oscan, pomtis)	penki	fimf
VI.	shash	ἕξ	sex	szeszi	saihs
VII.	sapta	ἑπτά	septem	septyni	sibun
VIII.	ashtau	ὀκτώ	octo	asztůni	ahtau
IX.	nava	ἐννέα	novem	dewyni	niun
X.	dasa	δέκα	decem	deszimt	taihun
XI.	ekâdasa	ἕνδεκα	undecim	wieno-lika	ain-lif
XII.	dvâdasa	δώδεκα	duodecim	dwy-lika	tva-lif
XX.	vinsati	εἴκοσι	viginti	dwi-deszimti	tvaitigjus
C.	satam	ἑκατόν	centum	szimtas	taihun taihund
M.	sahasram	χίλιοι	mille	tukstantis	þusundi.

If we cannot account for the coincidences between the French, Italian, Spanish, Portuguese, and Wallachian numerals, without admitting that all were derived from a common type, the Latin, the same conclusion is forced upon us by a comparison of the ancient numerals. They must have existed ready made in that language from which Sanskrit as well as Welsh is derived; but only as far as hundred. Thousand had not received expression at that early period, and hence the names for thousand differ, not however, without giving, by their very disagreement, some further indications as to the subsequent history of the Arian race. We see Sanskrit and Zend share the name for thousand in common, (Sk. sahasra, Zend hazanra), which shows, that after the southern branch had been severed from the northern, the ancestors of the Brahmans and Zoroastrians continued united for a time by the ties of a common language. The same conclusion may be drawn from the agreement between the Gothic thusundi and the Old Prussian tûsimtons (acc.), the Lithuanian tukstantis, the Old Slavonic tüisasta; while the Greeks and the Romans stand apart from all the rest, and seem to have formed, each independently, their own name for thousand.

This earliest period, then, previous to any national separation, is what I call the *mythopœic* period, for every one of these common Arian words is, in a certain sense, a mythe. These words were all originally appellative; they expressed one out of many attributes, which seemed characteristic of a certain object, and the selection of these attributes and their expression in language, represents a kind of unconscious poetry, which modern languages have lost altogether.

Language has been called fossil poetry. But as the artist does not know that the clay which he is handling contains the remnants of organic life, we do not feel that when we address a father, we call him protector, nor did the Greeks, when using the word δαήρ, brother-in-law, know that this term applied originally only to the younger brothers

of the husband, who stayed at home with the bride while their elder brother was out in the field or the forests. The Sanskrit devar meant originally play-mate,—it told its own story,—it was a mythe; but in Greek it has dwindled down into a mere name, or a technical term. Yet, even in Greek it is not allowed to form a feminine of δαήρ, as little as we should venture even now to form a masculine of 'daughter.'

Soon, however, languages lose their etymological conscience, and thus we find in Latin not only vidua, husbandless, (Penelope tam diu vidua viro suo caruit,) but viduus, a formation which, if analysed etymologically, is as absurd as the Teutonic a widower. But it must be confessed, that the old Latin viduus,* a name of Orcus, who had a temple outside Rome, makes it doubtful whether the Latin vidua is really the Sanskrit vidhavâ, however great their similarity; unless we admit that a verb viduare was derived from vidua, and that afterwards a new adjective was formed with a more general sense, so that viduus to a Roman ear meant nothing more than privatus.

But, it may be asked,—how does the fact, that the Arian languages possess this treasure of ancient names in common, or even the discovery that all these names had originally an expressive and poetical power, explain the phenomenon of mythological language among all the members of this family? How does it render intelligible that phase of the human mind which gave birth to the extraordinary stories of gods and heroes,—of gorgons and chimæras,—of things that no human eye had ever seen, and that no human mind in a healthy state could ever have conceived?

Before we can answer this question, we must enter into some more preliminary observations as to the formation of words. Tedious as this may seem, we believe that while engaged in these considerations, the mist of mythology will gradually clear away, and enable us to discover behind the floating clouds of the dawn of thought and language, that real nature which mythology has so long veiled and disguised.

All the common Arian words which we have hitherto examined referred to definite objects. They are all substantives, in so far as expressing something substantial, something open to sensuous perception. Nor is it in the power of language to express originally anything except objects as nouns, and qualities as verbs. Hence, the only definition we can give of language during that early state is, that it is the conscious expression in sound, of impressions received by all the senses.

To us, abstract nouns are so familiar that we can hardly

* Hartung, *Die Religion der Römer*, ii. 90.

DOMINICAN COLLEGE LIBRARY SAN RAFAEL

appreciate the difficulty which men experienced in forming them. We can scarcely imagine a language without abstract nouns. There are, however, dialects spoken at the present day which have no abstract nouns, and the more we go back in the history of languages, the smaller we find the number of these useful expressions. As far as language is concerned, an abstract word is nothing but an adjective raised into a substantive; but in thought the conception of a quality as a subject, is a matter of extreme difficulty, and, in strict logical parlance, impossible. If we say, 'I love virtue,' we seldom connect any definite notion with virtue. Virtue is not a being, however unsubstantial; it is nothing individual, personal, active; nothing that could by itself produce an expressible impression on our mind. The word virtue is only a short-hand expression, and when men said for the first time 'I love virtue,' what they meant by it originally was 'I love all things that are virtuous.'

But there are other words, which we hardly call abstract, but which nevertheless were so originally, and are so still, in form; I mean words like day and night, spring and winter, dawn and twilight, storm and thunder. For what do we mean if we speak of day and night, or of spring and winter? We may answer, a season, or any other portion of time. But what is time, in our conceptions? It is nothing substantial, nothing individual; it is a quality raised by language into a substance. Therefore if we say 'the day dawns,' 'the night approaches,' we predicate actions of things that cannot act, we affirm a proposition which, if analysed logically, would have no definable subject.

The same applies to collective words, such as sky and earth, dew and rain,—even to rivers and mountains. For if we say, 'the earth nourishes man,' we do not mean any tangible portion of soil, but the earth, conceived as a whole; nor do we mean by the sky the small horizon which our eye can scan. We imagine something which does not fall under our senses, but whether we call it a whole, a power, or an idea, in speaking of it we change it unawares into something individual.

Now in ancient languages every one of these words had necessarily a termination expressive of gender, and this naturally produced in the mind the corresponding idea of sex, so that these names received not only an individual, but a sexual character. There was no substantive which was not either masculine or feminine; neuters being of later growth, and distinguishable chiefly in the nominative.

What must have been the result of this? As long as people thought in language, it was simply impossible to speak of morning or evening, of spring and winter, without giving to these conceptions something of an individual, active, sexual,

and at last, personal character. They were either nothings, as they are nothings to our withered thought, or they were something; and then they could not be conceived as mere powers, but as beings powerful. Even in our time, though we have the conception of nature as a power, what do we mean by power, except something powerful? Now, in early language, nature was *Natura*, a mere adjective made substantive; she was the Mother always 'going to bring forth.' Was this not a more definite idea than that which we connect with nature? And let us look to our poets, who still think and feel in language,—that is, who use no word without having really enlivened it in their mind, who do not trifle with language, and may in this sense be called μυθολογοι. Can they speak of nature and similar things as neutral powers, without doing violence to their feelings? Let us open Wordsworth, and we shall hardly find him use an abstract term without some life and blood in it.

Religion.

Sacred Religion, mother of form and fear,
Dread arbitress of mutable respect,
New rites ordaining when the old are wrecked,
Or cease to please the fickle worshipper.

Winter.

Humanity, delighting to behold
A fond reflection of her own decay,
Hath painted Winter like a traveller old,
Propped on a staff, and, through the sullen day,
In hooded mantle, limping o'er the plain,
As though his weakness were disturbed by pain:
Or, if a juster fancy should allow
An undisputed symbol of command,
The chosen sceptre is a withered bough,
Infirmly grasped within a palsied hand.
These emblems suit the helpless and forlorn;
But mighty Winter the device shall scorn.
For he it was—dread Winter!—who beset,
Flinging round van and rear his ghastly net,
That host, when from the regions of the Pole
They shrunk, insane Ambition's barren goal,—
That host, as huge and strong as e'er defied
Their God, and placed their trust in human pride!
As fathers prosecute rebellious sons,
He smote the blossoms of their warrior youth;
He called on *Frost's* inexorable tooth
Life to consume in manhood's firmest hold . . . .
. . . And bade the *Snow* their ample backs bestride,
And to the battle ride.

So, again, of *Age and Hours.*

> *Age!* twine thy brows with fresh spring flowers,
> And call a train of laughing *Hours,*
> And bid them dance, and bid them sing;
> And thou, too, mingle in the ring!

Now, when writing these lines, Wordsworth could hardly have thought of the classical Horae: the conception of dancing Hours came as natural to his mind as to the poets of old.

Or, again, of *Storms and Seasons.*

> Ye *Storms,* resound the praises of your King!
> And ye mild Seasons—in a sunny clime,
> Midway, on some high hill, while father *Time*
> Looks on delighted,—meet in festal ring,
> And loud and long of Winter's triumph sing!

We are wont to call this poetical diction, and to make allowance for what seems to us exaggerated language. But to the poet it is no exaggeration, nor was it to the ancient poets of language. Poetry is older than prose, and abstract speech more difficult than the fulness of a poet's sympathy with nature. It requires reflection to divest nature of her living expression, to see in the swift-riding clouds nothing but vaporous exhalations, in the frowning mountains masses of stone, and in the lightning electric sparks. Wordsworth feels what he says, when he exclaims—

> Mountains, and Vales, and Floods, I call on you
> To share the passion of a just disdain;

and when he speaks of 'the last hill that parleys with the setting sun,' this expression came to him as he was communing with nature; it was a thought untranslated as yet into the prose of our traditional and emaciated speech; it was a thought such as the men of old would not have been ashamed of in their common conversation.

There are some poems of this modern ancient, which are all mythology, and as we shall have to refer to them hereafter, I shall give one more extract, which to a Hindu and an ancient Greek would have been more intelligible than it is to us.

> Hail, orient Conqueror of gloomy Night!
> Thou that canst shed the bliss of gratitude
> On hearts, howe'er insensible or rude;
> Whether thy punctual visitations smite
> The haughty towers where monarchs dwell,
> Or thou, impartial Sun, with presence bright
> Cheer'st the low threshold of the peasant's cell!
> Not unrejoiced I see thee climb the sky,
> In naked splendour, clear from mist and haze,
> Or cloud approaching to divert the rays,

Which even in deepest winter testify
  Thy power and majesty,
Dazzling the vision that presumes to gaze.
Well does thine aspect usher in this Day;
As aptly suits therewith that modest pace
  Submitted to the chains
That bind thee to the path which God ordains!
  That thou shouldst trace,
Till, with the heavens and earth, thou pass away!
Nor less, the stillness of these frosty plains—
Their utter stillness, and the silent grace
Of yon ethereal summits, white with snow,
(Whose tranquil pomp and spotless purity
  Report of storms gone by
  To us who tread below)—
Do with the service of this Day accord.
Divinest object which th' uplifted eye
Of mortal man is suffered to behold;
Thou, who upon these snow-clad Heights has poured
Meek lustre, nor forget'st the humble Vale;
Thou who dost warm Earth's universal mould,
And for thy bounty wert not unadored
  By pious men of old;
Once more, heart-cheering Sun, I bid thee hail!
Bright be thy course to-day,—let not this promise fail!

Why then, if we ourselves, in speaking of the Sun or the Storms, of Sleep and Death, of Earth and Dawn, connect either no distinct idea at all with these names, or allow them to cast over our mind the fleeting shadows of the poetry of old; why, if we, when speaking with the warmth which is natural to the human heart, call upon the Winds and the Sun, the Ocean and the Sky, as if they would still hear us; why, if plastic thought cannot represent any one of these beings or powers, without giving them, if not a human form, at least human life and human feeling—why should we wonder at the ancients, with their language throbbing with life and revelling in colour, if instead of the grey outlines of our modern thought, they threw out those living forms of nature, endowed with human powers, nay, with powers more than human, inasmuch as the light of the Sun was brighter than the light of a human eye, and the roaring of the Storms louder than the shouts of the human voice. We may be able to account for the origin of rain and dew, of storm and thunder; yet, to the great majority of mankind, all these things, unless they are mere names, are still what they were to Homer, only perhaps less beautiful, less poetical, less real, and living.

So much for that peculiar difficulty which the human mind experiences in speaking of collective or abstract ideas,—a

difficulty which, as we shall see, will explain many of the difficulties of Mythology.

We have now to consider a similar feature of ancient languages—the auxiliary verbs. They hold the same position among verbs, as abstract nouns among substantives. They are of later origin, and had all originally a more material and expressive character. Our auxiliary verbs have had to pass through a long chain of vicissitudes before they arrived at the withered and lifeless form which fits them so well for the purposes of our abstract prose. Habere, which is now used in all the Romance languages simply to express a past tense, *j'ai aimé*, I loved, was originally, to hold fast, to hold back, as we may see in its derivative, habenæ, the reins. Thus tenere, to hold, becomes, in Spanish, an auxiliary verb, that can be used very much in the same manner as habere. The Greek ἔχω is the Sanskrit sah, and meant originally, to be strong, to be able, or to can. The Latin fui, I was, the Sanskrit bhû, to be, corresponds to the Greek φύω, and there shows still its original and material power of growing, in an intransitive and transitive sense. As, the radical of the Sanskrit as-mi, the Greek ἐμ-μί, the Lithuanian as-mi, I am, is probably connected with another root *âs*, to sit, which we see in Greek ἧσ-ται, Sanskrit âs-te. Stare, to stand, sinks down in the Romance dialects to a mere auxiliary, as in *j'ai été*, I have been, *i.e.* habeo statum, I have stood; j'ai-été convaincu, I have stood convinced; the phonetic change of statum into été being borne out by the transition of status into état. The German werden, which is used to form futures and passives, the Gothic varth, points back to the Sanskrit vrit, the Latin verto. Will, again, in *he will go*, has lost its radical meaning of wishing; and shall, used in the same tense, *I shall go*, hardly betrays, even to the etymologist, its original power of legal or moral obligation. *Schuld*, however, in German means debt and sin, and *soll* has there not yet taken a merely temporal signification, the first trace of which may be discovered, however, in the names of the three Teutonic Parcæ. These are called *Vurdh*, *Vurdhandi*, and *Skuld*—Past, Present, and Future.* But what could be the original conception of a verb which, even in its earliest application, has already the abstract meaning of moral duty or legal obligation? Where could language, which can only draw upon the material world for its nominal and verbal treasures, find something analogous to the abstract idea of He shall pay, or, He ought to yield? Grimm, who has endeavoured to follow the German language into its most secret recesses, proposes an explanation of this

* Kuhn, *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung*, iii. 449.

verb, which deserves serious consideration, however strange and incredible it may appear at first sight.

Shall, and its preterite *should*, have the following forms in Gothic :—

Present.	Preterite.
Skal	Skulda
Skalt	Skuldês
Skal	Skulda
Skulum	Skuldedum
Skuluþ	Skuldeduþ
Skulun	Skuldedun

In Gothic this verb skal, which seems to be a present, can be proved to be an old perfect, analogous to Greek perfects like *οἶδα*, which have the form of the perfect but the power of the present. There are several verbs of the same character in the German language, and in English they can be detected by the absence of the *s*, as the termination of the third person singular of the present. Skal, then, according to Grimm, means, I owe, I am bound,—but originally, it meant I have killed. The chief guilt punished by ancient Teutonic law, was the guilt of manslaughter,—and in many cases it could be atoned for by a fine. Hence, skal meant literally, I am guilty, ich bin schuldig ; and afterwards, when this full expression had been ground down into a legal phrase, new expressions became possible, such as 'I have killed a free man, a serf,' *i.e.* I am guilty of a free man, a serf, and at last, 'I owe (the fine for having slain) a free man, a serf. In this manner Grimm accounts for the still later and more anomalous expressions, such as 'he shall pay,' *i.e.* he is guilty to pay,' (er ist schuldig zu zahlen) ; he shall go,—*i.e.* he must go, and last, I shall withdraw, *i.e.* I feel bound to withdraw.

A change of meaning like this seems, no doubt, violent and fanciful, but we should feel more inclined to accept it, if we considered how almost every word we use discloses similar changes as soon as we analyse it etymologically, and then follow gradually its historical growth. If we say, I am obliged to go, or, I am bound to pay, we forget that the origin of these expressions carries us back to times when men were bound to go, or bound over to pay. Hoc me fallit means, in Latin, 'it deceives me,' 'it escapes me.' Afterwards, it took the sense of 'it is removed from me,' I want it, I must have it: and hence, *il me faut*, I must. Again, *I may* is the Gothic.

Mag, maht, mag, magum, maguþ, magun,

And its primary signification was I am strong. Now, this verb also was originally a preterite, and derived from a root which meant, to beget, whence the Gothic magus, son,—*i.e.* begotten, the Scotch *Mac*, and Gothic magaths, daughter, the English maid.

In mythological language we must make due allowance for the absence of merely auxiliary words. Every word, whether noun or verb, had still its full original power during the mythopœic ages. Words were heavy and unwieldy. They said more than they ought to say, and hence, much of the strangeness of the mythological language, which we can only understand by watching the natural growth of speech. Where we speak of the sun following the dawn, the ancient poets could only speak and think of the sun loving and embracing the dawn. What is with us a sunset, was to them the Sun growing old, decaying, or dying. Our sunrise was to them the Night giving birth to a brilliant child; and in the Spring they really saw the Sun or the Sky embracing the earth with a warm embrace, and showering treasures into the lap of nature. There are many mythes in Hesiod, of late origin, where we have only to replace a full verb by an auxiliary, in order to change mythical into logical language. Hesiod calls Nyx (Night) the mother of Moros (Fate), and the dark Kêr (Destruction); of Thanatos (Death), Hypnos (Sleep), and the tribe of the Oneiroi (Dreams). And this her progeny she is said to have borne without a father. Again, she is called the mother of Mômos (Blame), and of the woeful Oizys (Woe), and of the Hesperides (Evening Stars), who guard the beautiful golden apples on the other side of the far-famed Okeanos, and the trees that bear fruit. She also bore Nemesis (Vengeance), and Apatê (Fraud), and Philotês (Lust), and the pernicious Geras (Old Age), and the strong-minded Eris (Strife). Now, let us use our modern expressions, such as 'the stars are seen as the night approaches,' 'we sleep,' 'we dream,' 'we die,' 'we run danger during night,' 'nightly revels lead to strife, angry discussions, and woe,' 'many nights bring old age, and at last death,' 'an evil deed concealed at first by the darkness of night will at last be revealed by the day,' 'Night herself will be revenged on the criminal,' and we have translated the language of Hesiod —a language to a great extent understood by the people whom he addressed—into our modern form of thought and speech.* All this is hardly mythological language, but rather a poetical and proverbial kind of expression known to all

* As to Philotes being the Child of Night, Juliet understood what it meant when she said—

> 'Spread thy close curtain, love-performing Night!
> That unawares, eyes may wink; and Romeo
> Leap to these arms, untalked of and unseen!—
> Lovers can see to do their amorous rites
> By their own beauties; or, if Love be blind,
> It best agrees with Night.'

poets, whether modern or ancient, and frequently to be found in the language of common people.

Uranos, in the language of Hesiod, is used as a name for the sky; he is made or born that 'he should be a firm place for the blessed gods.'* It is said twice, that Uranos covers everything, (v. 127), and that when he brings the night he is stretched out everywhere, embracing the earth. This sounds almost as if the Greek mythe had still preserved a recollection of the etymological power of Uranos. For Uranos is the Sanskrit Varu*n*a, and this is derived from a root VAR, to cover; Varu*n*a being in the *Veda* also a name of the firmament, but especially connected with the night, and opposed to Mitra, the day. At all events, the name of Uranos recalled to the Greek something of its usual meaning, and when we see him called *ἀστερόεις*, the starry heaven, which was not the case with names like Apollo or Dionysos, we can hardly believe, as Mr. Grote says, that to the Greek, 'Uranos, Nyx, Hypnos, and Oneiros (Heaven, Night, Sleep, and Dream) are persons, just as much as Zeus and Apollo.' We need only read a few lines further in Hesiod, in order to see that the progeny of Gæa, of which Uranos is the first, has not yet altogether arrived at that mythological personification or crystallization which makes most of the Olympian gods so difficult and doubtful in their original character. The poet has asked the Muses in the introduction how the gods and the earth were first born, and the rivers and the endless sea, and the bright stars, and the wide heaven above' (*οὐρανὸς εὐρὺς ὑπερθεν*). The whole poem of the *Theogony* is an answer to this question; and we can hardly doubt therefore that the Greek saw in some of the names that follow, simply poetical conceptions of real objects, such as the earth, and the rivers, and the mountains. Uranos, the first offspring of Gæa, is afterwards raised into a deity,—endowed with human feelings and attributes; but, the very next offspring of Gæa, *Οὐρέα μακρά* the great Mountains, are even in language represented as neuter, and can therefore hardly claim to be considered as persons like Zeus and Apollo.

Mr. Grote goes too far in insisting on the purely literal meaning of the whole of Greek mythology. Some mythological figures of speech remained in the Greek language to a very late period, and were perfectly understood,—that is to say, they required as little explanation as our expressions of

---

Hesiod, *Theog.* 128—

Γαῖα δέ τοι πρῶτον μὲν ἐγείνατο ἶσον ἑαυτῇ
Οὐρανὸν ἀστερόεντθ', ἵνα μιν περὶ πάντα καλύπτοι,
ὄφρ' εἴη μακάρεσσι θεοῖς ἕδος ἀσφαλὲς αἰεί.

'the sun sets,' or 'the sun rises.' Mr. Grote feels compelled to admit this, but he declines to draw any further conclusions from it. 'Although some of the attributes and actions ascribed to these persons,' he says, 'are often explicable by allegory, the whole series and system of them never are so: the theorist who adopts this course of explanation finds that, after one or two simple and obvious steps, the path is no longer open, and he is forced to clear a way for himself by gratuitous refinements and conjectures.' Here, then, Mr. Grote admits what he calls allegory as an ingredient of mythology; still he makes no further use of it, and leaves the whole of mythology as a riddle, that cannot and ought not to be solved, as something irrational—as a past that was never present, declining even to attempt a partial explanation of this important problem in the history of the Greek mind. Such a want of scientific courage would have put a stop to many systems which have since grown to completeness, but which at first had to make the most timid and uncertain steps. In palæontological sciences we must learn to ignore certain things; and what Suetonius says of the grammarian, 'boni grammatici est nonnulla etiam nescire,' applies with particular force to the mythologist. It is in vain to attempt to solve the secret of every name; and nobody has expressed this with greater modesty than he who has laid the most lasting foundation of Comparative Mythology. Grimm, in the introduction to his *German Mythology*, says, without disguise, 'I shall indeed interpret all that I can, but I cannot interpret all that I should like.' But surely Otfried Müller had opened a path into the labyrinth of Greek mythology, which a scholar of Mr. Grote's power and genius might have followed, and which at least he ought to have proved as either right or wrong. How late mythological language was in vogue among the Greeks has been shown by O. Müller (p. 65) in the mythe of Kyrene. The Greek town of Kyrene in Libya was founded about Olymp. 37; the ruling race derived its origin from the Minyans, who reigned chiefly in Iolkos, in Southern Thessaly; the foundation of the colony was due to the oracle of Apollo at Pytho. Hence, the mythe—'The heroic maid Kyrene, who lived in Thessaly, is loved by Apollo and carried off to Libya;' while in modern language we should say,—'The town of Kyrene, in Thessaly, sent a colony to Libya, under the auspices of Apollo.' Many more instances might be given, where the mere substitution of a more matter-of-fact verb divests a mythe at once of its miraculous appearance.*

Kaunos is called the son of Miletos, *i.e.* Kretan colonists

* Kanne's *Mythology*, § 10, p. xxxii.

from Miletos had founded the town of Kaunos in Lycia. Again, the mythe says that Kaunos fled from Miletos to Lycia, and his sister Byblos was changed, by sorrow over her lost brother, into a fountain. Here Miletos in Ionia, being better known than the Miletos in Kreta, has been brought in by mistake, Byblos being simply a small river near the Ionian Miletos. Again, Pausanias tells us as a matter of history, that Miletos, a beautiful boy, fled from Kreta to Ionia, in order to escape the jealousy of Minos,—the fact being, that Miletos in Ionia was a colony of Miletos of Kreta, and Minos the most famous King of Kreta. Again, Marpessa is called the daughter of Evenos,—and a mythe represents her as carried away by Idas—Idas being the name of a famous hero of the town of Marpessa. The fact, implied by the mythe and confirmed by other evidence, is, that colonists started from the river Evenos, and founded Marpessa in Messina. And here again, the mythe adds, that Evenos, after trying in vain to reconquer his daughter from Idas, was changed by sorrow into a river, like Byblos, the sister of Miletos.

If the Hellenes call themselves *αὐτόχθονες*, we fancy we understand what is meant by this expression. But, if we are informed that *πύῤῥα* was the oldest name of Thessaly, and that Hellen was the son of Pyrrha, Mr. Grote would say that we have here to deal with a mythe, and that the Greeks at least, never doubted that there really was one individual called Pyrrha, and another called Hellen. Now, this may be true with regard to the later Greeks, such as Homer and Hesiod;—but was it so—could it have been so originally? Language is always language,—it always meant something originally, and he, whoever it was, who first, instead of calling the Hellenes born of the soil, spoke of Pyrrha, the mother of Hellen, must have meant something intelligible and rational, he could not have meant a friend of his whom he knew by the name of Hellen, and an old lady called Pyrrha; he meant what we mean if we speak of Italy as the mother of Art.

Even in more modern times than those of which Otfried Müller speaks,—we find that 'to speak mythologically,' was the fashion among poets and philosophers. Pausanias complains of those 'who genealogize everything, and make Pythis the son of Delphos.' The story of Eros in the Phædros is called a mythe (*μύθος*, 254 D, *λόγος*, 257 B);—yet Sokrates says ironically,—'that it is one of those which you may believe or not, (*τούτοις δὴ ἔξεστι μὲν πείθεσθαι, ἔξεστι δὲ μή*). Again, when he tells the story of the Egyptian god Theuth, he calls it a 'tradition of old' (*ἀκοήν γ' ἔχω λέγειν τῶν προτέρων*), but Phædros knows at once that it is one of Sokrates' own making, and he says to him, 'Sokrates, thou

makest easily Egyptian or any other stories' (λόγοι). When Pindar calls Apophasis the daughter of Epimetheus, every Greek understood this mythological language as well as if he had said 'an after-thought leads to an excuse.* Nay, even in Homer, when the lame Litae (Prayers) are said to follow Atê (Fate), trying to appease her, a Greek understood this language as well as we do, when we say that 'Hell is paved with good intentions.'

When Prayers are called the daughters of Zeus, we are hardly as yet within the sphere of pure mythology. For Zeus was to the Greeks the protector of the supplices, Ζεὺς ἱκετέσιος,—and hence prayers are called his daughters, as we might call Liberty the daughter of England, or Prayer the offspring of the soul.

All these sayings, however, though mythical, are not yet mythes. It is the essential character of a true mythe that it should no longer be intelligible by a reference to the spoken language. The plastic character of ancient language, which we have traced in the formation of nouns and verbs, is not sufficient to explain how a mythe could have lost its expressive power or its consciousness. Making due allowance for the difficulty of forming abstract nouns and abstract verbs, we should yet be unable to account for anything beyond allegorical poetry among the nations of antiquity; mythology would still remain a riddle. Here, then, we must call to our aid another powerful ingredient in the formation of ancient speech, for which I find no better name than *Polyonymy* and *Synonymy*.† Most nouns, as we have seen before, were originally appellatives or predicates, expressive of what seemed at the time the most characteristic attribute of an object. But as most objects have more than one attribute, and as, under different aspects one or the other attribute might seem more appropriate to form the name, it happened by necessity that most objects, during the early period of language, had more than one name. In the course of time, the greater portion of these names became useless, and they were mostly replaced in

* O. Müller has pointed out how the different parents given to the *Erinyes* by different poets were suggested by the character which each poet ascribed to them. 'Evidently,' he says, in his *Essay on the Eumenides*, p. 184, 'this genealogy answered better to the views and poetical objects of Æschylos than one of the current genealogies by which the Erinyes are derived from Skotos and Gæa (Sophokles), Kronos and Eurynome (in a work ascribed to Epimenides), Phorkys (Euphorion), Gæa Eurynome (Istron), Acheron and Night (Eudemos), Hades and Persephone (Orphic hymns), Hades and Styx (Athenodoros and Mnaseas.) See, however, *Ares*, by H. D. Müller, p. 67.

† See the Author's letter to Chev. Bunsen *On the Turanian Languages*, p. 35.

literary dialects by one fixed name, which might be called the proper name of such objects. The more ancient a language, the richer it is in synonymes.

Synonymes, again, if used constantly, must naturally give rise to a number of homonymes. If we may call the sun by fifty names expressive of different qualities, some of these names will be applicable to other objects also which happen to possess the same quality. These different objects would then be called by the same name—they would become homonymes.

In the *Veda*, the earth is called urvî (wide), prithvî (broad), mahî (great), and many more names of which the Nighantu mentions twenty-one. These twenty-one words would be synonymes. But urvî (wide) is not only given as a name of the earth, but also means a river. Prithvî (broad) means not only earth, but sky and dawn. Mahî (great, strong) is used for cow and speech, as well for earth. Hence, earth, river, sky, dawn, cow, and speech, would become homonymes. All these names, however, are simple and intelligible. But most of the old terms, thrown out by language at the first burst of youthful poetry, are based on bold metaphors. These metaphors once forgotten, or the meaning of the roots whence the words were derived once dimmed and changed, many of these words would naturally lose their radical as well as their poetical meaning. They would become mere names handed down in the conversation of a family; understood, perhaps, by the grandfather, familiar to the father, but strange to the son, and misunderstood by the grandson. This misunderstanding may arise in various manners. Either the radical meaning of a word is forgotten, and thus what was originally an appellative, or a name, in the etymological sense of the word (nomen stands for gnomen, quo gnoscimus res, like natus for gnatus,) dwindled down into a mere sound—a name in the modern sense of the word. Thus *ζεύς*, being originally a name of the sky, like the Sanskrit *dyáus*, became gradually a proper name, which betrayed its appellative meaning only in a few proverbial expressions, such as *ζεὺς ὗει*, or 'sub Jove frigido.'

Frequently it happened that after the true etymological meaning of a word had been forgotten, a new meaning was attached to it by a kind of etymological instinct which exists even in modern languages. Thus, *Λυκηγενής*, the son of light—Apollo, was changed into a son of Lycia; *Δήλιος*, the bright one, gave rise to the mythe of the birth of Apollo in Delos.

Again, where two names existed for the same object, two persons would spring up out of the two names, and as the same stories could be told of either, they would naturally be represented as brothers and sisters—as parent and child.

Thus we find Selene, the moon, side by side with Mene, the moon; Helios, the Sun, and Phœbos; and in most of the Greek heroes we can discover humanized forms of Greek gods, with names which, in many instances, were epithets of their divine prototypes. Still more frequently it happened that adjectives connected with a word as applied to one object, were used with the same word even though applied to a different object. What was told of the Sea was told of the Sky, and the Sun once being called a lion or a wolf, was soon endowed with claws and mane, even where the animal metaphor was forgotten. Thus the Sun with his golden rays might be called 'golden-handed,' *hand* being expressed by the same word as *ray*. But when the same epithet was applied to Apollo or Indra, a mythe would spring up, as we find it in German and Sanskrit mythology, telling us that Indra lost his hand, and that it was replaced by a hand made of gold.

Here we have some of the keys to mythology, but the manner of handling them can only be learnt from comparative philology. As in French it is difficult to find the radical meaning of many a word, unless we compare it with its corresponding forms in Italian, Spanish, or Provençal; we should find it impossible to discover the origin of many a Greek word, without comparing it with its more or less corrupt relatives in German, Latin, Slavonic, and Sanskrit. Unfortunately we have in this ancient circle of languages nothing corresponding to Latin, by which we can test the more or less original form of a word in French, Italian, and Spanish. Sanskrit is not the mother of Latin and Greek, as Latin is the mother of French and Italian. But although Sanskrit is but one among many sisters—it is no doubt the eldest—in so far as it has preserved its words in their most primitive state; and if we once succeed in tracing a Latin and Greek word to its corresponding form in Sanskrit, we are generally able at the same time to account for its formation, and to fix its radical meaning. What should we know of the original meaning of *πατήρ*, *μήτηρ*, and *θυγάτηρ*,* if we were reduced to the knowledge of one language like Greek? But as soon as we trace these words to Sanskrit, their primitive power is clearly indicated. O. Müller was one of the first to see and acknowledge that classical philology must surrender all etymological research to comparative philology, and that the origin of Greek words cannot be settled by a mere reference to Greek. This

* Here is a specimen of Greek etymology, from the *Etymologicum Magnum*:—*Θυγάτηρ, παρὰ τὸ θύειν καὶ ὁρμᾶν κατὰ γαστρὸς· ἐκ τοῦ θύω καὶ τοῦ γαστήρ· λέγεται γὰρ τὰ θήλεα τάχιον κινεῖσθαι ἐν τῇ μήτρᾳ.*

applies with particular force to mythological names. In order to become mythological, it was necessary that the radical meaning of certain names should have been obscured and forgotten in the language to which they belong. Thus what is mythological in one language, is frequently natural and intelligible in another. We say, 'the sun sets,' but in our own Teutonic mythology, a seat or throne is given to the sun on which he sits down, as in Greek Eos is called χρυσόθρονος, or as the Modern Greek speaks of the setting sun as ἥλιος βασιλεύει. We doubt about Hekate, but we understand at once Ἕκατος and Ἑκατηβόλος. We hesitate about Lucina, but we accept immediately what is a mere contraction of Lucna, the Latin Luna. What is commonly called Hindu mythology, is of little or no avail for comparative purposes. The stories of Śiva, Vishṇu, Mahâdeva, Pârvati, Kali, Krishṇa, &c., are of late growth, indigenous to India, and full of wild and fanciful conceptions. But while this late mythology of the Purâṇas and even of the Epic poems, offers no assistance to the comparative mythologist, a whole world of primitive, natural, and intelligible mythology has been preserved to us in the *Veda*. The mythology of the *Veda* is to comparative mythology what Sanskrit has been to comparative grammar. There is, fortunately, no system of religion or mythology in the *Veda*. Names are used in one hymn as appellatives, in another as names of gods. The same god is sometimes represented as supreme, sometimes as equal, sometimes as inferior to others. The whole nature of these so-called gods is still transparent; their first conception, in many cases, clearly perceptible. There are as yet no genealogies, no settled marriages between gods and goddesses. The father is sometimes the son, the brother is the husband, and she who in one hymn is the mother, is in another the wife. As the conceptions of the poet varied, so varied the nature of these gods. Nowhere is the wide distance which separates the ancient poems of India from the most ancient literature of Greece more clearly felt than when we compare the growing mythes of the *Veda* with the full-grown and decayed mythes on which the poetry of Homer is founded. The *Veda* is the real Theogony of the Arian races, while that of Hesiod is a distorted caricature of the original image. If we want to know whither the human mind, though endowed with the natural consciousness of a divine power, is driven necessarily and inevitably by the irresistible force of language as applied to supernatural and abstract ideas, we must read the *Veda;* and if we want to tell the Hindus what they are worshipping—mere names of natural phenomena, gradually obscured, personified, and deified,—we must make them read the

Veda. It was a mistake of the early Fathers to treat the Heathen gods* as demons or evil spirits, and we must take care not to commit the same error with regard to the Hindu god. Their gods have no more right to any substantive existence than Eos or Hemera—than Nyx or Apatê. They are masks without an actor,—the creations of man, not his creators; they are nomina, not numina; names without being, not beings without names.

In some instances, no doubt, it happens that a Greek, or a Latin, or a Teutonic mythe, may be explained, from the resources which each of these languages still possesses, as there are many words in Greek which can be explained etymologically without any reference to Sanskrit or Gothic. We shall begin with some of these mythes, and then proceed to the more difficult, which must receive light from more distant regions, whether from the snowy rocks of Iceland and the songs of the *Edda*, or from the borders of the 'Seven Rivers,' and the hymns of the *Veda*.

The rich imagination, the quick perception, the intellectual vivacity, and ever-varying fancy of the Greek nation, make it easy to understand that, after the separation of the Arian race, no language was richer, no mythology more varied, than that of the Greeks. Words were created with wonderful facility, and were forgotten again with that carelessness which the consciousness of inexhaustible power imparts to men of genius. The creation of every word was originally a poem, embodying a bold metaphor or a bright conception. But, like the popular poetry of Greece, these words, if they were adopted by tradition, and lived on in the language of a family, of a city, of a tribe, in the dialects, or in the national speech of Greece, soon forgot the father that had given them birth, or the poet to whom they owed their existence. Their genealogical descent and native character were unknown to the Greeks themselves, and their etymological meaning would have baffled the most ingenious antiquarian. The Greeks, however, cared as little about the etymological individuality of their words as they cared to know the name of every bard that had first sung the Aristeia of Menelaos or Diomedes. One Homer was enough to satisfy their curiosity, and any etymology that explained any part of the meaning of a word was welcome, no historical considerations

---

* Aristotle has given an opinion of the Greek gods in a passage of the *Metaphysics*. He is attacking the Platonic ideas, and tries to show their contradictory character, calling them *αἰσθητὰ ἀίδια*, eternal uneternals, *i.e.* things that cannot have any real existence; as men, he adds, maintain that there are gods, but give them a human form, thus making them really 'immortal mortals,' *i.e.* non-entities.

being ever allowed to interfere with ingenious guesses. It is known how Sokrates changes, on the spur of the moment, Eros into a god of wings, but Homer is quite as ready with etymologies, and they are useful, at least so far as they prove that the real etymology of the names of the gods had been forgotten long before Homer.

We can best enter into the original meaning of a Greek mythe, when some of the persons who act in it have preserved names intelligible in Greek. When we find the names of Eos, Selene, Helios, or Herse, we have words which tell their own story, and we have a *πού στῶ* for the rest of the mythe. Let us take the beautiful mythe of Selene and Endymion. Endymion is the son of Zeus and Kalyke, but he is also the son of Aethlios, a king of Elis, who is himself called a son of Zeus, and whom Endymion is said to have succeeded as King of Elis. This localizes our mythe, and shows, at least, that Elis is its birthplace, and that, according to Greek custom, the reigning race of Elis derived its origin from Zeus. The same custom prevailed in India, and gave rise to the two great royal families of ancient India—the so-called Solar and the Lunar races: and Purûravas, of whom more by and by, says of himself,—

> The great king of day
> And monarch of the night are my progenitors;
> Their grandson I. . . . .

There may, then, have been a King of Elis, Aethlios, and he may have had a son, Endymion; but what the mythe tells of Endymion could not have happened to the King of Elis. The mythe transfers Endymion into Karia, to Mount Latmos, because it was in the Latmian cave that Selene saw the beautiful sleeper, loved him and lost him. Now about the meaning of Selene, there can be no doubt; but even if tradition had only preserved her other name, Asterodia, we should have had to translate this synonyme, as Moon, as 'Wanderer among the stars.' But who is Endymion? It is one of the many names of the sun, but with special reference to the setting or dying sun. It is derived from *ἐν-δύω*, a verb which, in classical Greek, is never used for setting, because the simple verb *δύω* had become the technical term for sunset. *Δυσμαὶ ἡλίου*, the setting of the sun, is opposed to *ἀνατόλαι*, the rising. Now, *δύω* meant, originally, to dive into; and expressions like *ἠέλιος δ' ἄρ' ἔδυ*, the sun dived, presupposes an earlier conception of *ἔδυ πόντον*, he dived into the sea. Thus Thetis addresses her companions, *Il.* xviii. 140.

> *Ὑμεῖς μὲν νῦν δῦτε θαλάσσης εὐρέα κόλπον,*
> You may now dive into the broad bosom of the sea.

Other dialects, particularly of maritime nations, have the same expression. In Lat. we find,* 'Cur *mergat* seras aequore flammas.' In Old Norse, 'Sól gengr i aegi.' Slavonic nations represent the sun as a woman stepping into her bath in the evening, and rising refreshed and purified in the morning; or they speak of the Sea as the mother of the Sun, and of the Sun as sinking into her mother's arms at night. We may suppose, therefore, that in some Greek dialect ἐνδύω was used in the same sense; and that from ἐνδύω, ἐνδύμα, was formed to express sunset. From this was formed ἐνδυμίων,† like οὐρανίων from οὐρανός, and like most of the names of the Greek months. If ἐνδύμα had become a common name for sunset, the mythe of Endymion could never have arisen. But the original meaning of Endymion being once forgotten, what was told originally of the setting sun was now told of a name, which, in order to have any meaning, had to be changed into a god or a hero. The setting sun *once* slept in the Latmian cave, the cave of night—Latmos being derived from the same root as Leto, Latona, the night;—but *now* he sleeps on Mount Latmos, in Karia. Endymion, sinking into eternal sleep after a life of but one day, was *once* the setting sun, the son of Zeus—the brilliant Sky, and Kalyke—the covering night (from καλύπτω); or, according to another saying, of Zeus and Protogeneia, the first-born goddess, or the Dawn, who is always represented, either as the mother, the sister, or the forsaken wife of the Sun. *Now* he is the son of a King of Elis, probably for no other reason except that it was usual for kings to take names of good omen, connected with the sun, or the moon, or the stars,—in which case a mythe, connected with a solar name, would naturally be transferred to its human namesake. In the ancient poetical and proverbial language of Elis, people said 'Selene loves and watches Endymion,' instead of 'it is getting late;' 'Selene embraces Endymion,' instead of 'the sun is setting and the moon is rising;' Selene kisses Endymion into sleep,' instead of 'it is night.' These expressions remained long after their meaning had ceased to be understood; and as the human mind is generally as anxious for a reason as ready to invent one, a story arose by common consent, and without any personal effort, that Endymion must have been a young lad loved by a young lady, Selene; and, if children were anxious to know still more, there would always be a grandmother happy to tell them that this young Endymion was the son of the Proto-

* Grimm's *Mythology*, p. 704.

† Lauer, in his *System of Greek Mythology*, explains Endymion as the Diver. Gerhard in his *Greek Mythology* gives Ἐνδυμίων as ὁ ἐν δύμῃ ὤν.

geneia,—she half meaning and half not meaning by that name the Dawn, who gave birth to the sun; or of Kalyke, the dark and covering Night. This name, once touched, would set many chords vibrating; three or four different reasons might be given (as they really were given by ancient poets) why Endymion fell into this everlasting sleep, and if any one of these was alluded to by a popular poet, it became a mythological fact, repeated by later poets; so that Endymion grew at last almost into a type, no longer of the setting sun, but of a handsome boy beloved of a chaste maiden, and therefore a most likely name for a young prince. Many mythes have thus been transferred to real persons, by a mere similarity of name, though it must be admitted that there is no historical evidence whatsoever that there ever was a Prince of Elis, called by the name of Endymion.

Such is the growth of a legend, originally a mere word, a μύθος, probably one of those many words which have but a local currency, and lose their value if they are taken to distant places,—words useless for the daily interchange of thought,—spurious coins in the hands of the many,—yet not thrown away, but preserved as curiosities and ornaments, and deciphered at last, after many centuries, by the antiquarian. Unfortunately, we do not possess these legends as they passed originally from mouth to mouth in villages or mountain castles—legends such as Grimm has collected in his *Mythology*, from the language of the poor people in Germany—not as they were told by the older members of a family, who spoke a language half intelligible to themselves and strange to their children,—not, as the poet of a rising city embodied the traditions of his neighbourhood in a continuous poem, and gave to them a certain form and permanence. Unless where Homer has preserved a local mythe, all is arranged as a system, with the *Theogony* as its beginning, the *Siege of Troy* as its centre, and the *Return of the Heroes* as its end. But how many parts of Greek mythology are never mentioned by Homer!—We then come to Hesiod—a moralist and theologian, and again we find but a small segment of the mythological language of Greece. Thus, our chief sources are the ancient chroniclers, who took mythology for history, and used of it only so much as answered their purpose. And not even these are preserved to us, but we only believe that they formed the sources from which later writers, such as Apollodorus and the scholiasts, borrowed their information. The first duty of the mythologist is, therefore, to disentangle this cluster, to remove all that is systematic, and to reduce each mythe to its primitive unsystematic form. Much that is unessential has to be cut away altogether, and

after the rust is removed, we have to determine first of all, as with ancient coins, the locality, and, if possible, the age, of each mythe, by the character of its workmanship; and as we arrange ancient medals into gold, silver, and copper coins, we have to distinguish most carefully between the legends of gods, heroes, and men. If, then, we succeed in deciphering the ancient names and legends of Greek or any other mythology, we learn that the past that stands before our eyes, in Greek mythology, has had its present,—that there are traces of organic thought in these petrified relics,—and that they once formed the surface of the Greek language. The legend of Endymion was present at the time when the people of Elis understood the old saying of the Moon (or Selene) rising under the cover of Night (or in the Latmian cave), to see and admire, in silent love, the beauty of the setting Sun, the sleeper Endymion, the son of Zeus, who granted to him the double boon of eternal sleep and everlasting youth.

Endymion is not the Sun in the divine character of Phoibos Apollon, but a conception of the Sun in his daily course, as rising early from the womb of Dawn, and after a short and brilliant career, setting in the evening, never to return again to this mortal life. Similar conceptions are frequent in Arian mythology, and the Sun viewed in this light is sometimes represented as divine, yet not immortal,—sometimes as living, but sleeping,—sometimes as a mortal beloved by a goddess, yet tainted by the fate of humanity. Thus, *Tithonos* being derived from the same root as Titan,* expressed originally the idea of the Sun in his daily or yearly character. He also, like Endymion, does not enjoy the full immortality of Zeus and Apollon. Endymion retains his youth, but is doomed to sleep. Tithonos is made immortal, but as Eos forgot to ask for his eternal youth, he pines away as a decrepit old man, in the arms of his ever youthful wife, who loved him when he was young, and is kind to him in his old age. Other traditions, careless about contradictions, or ready to solve them sometimes by the most atrocious expedients, call Tithonos the son of Eos and Kephalos, as Endymion was the son of Protogeneia, the Dawn; and this freedom in handling a mythe shows, that at first, a Greek knew what it meant if Eos was said to leave every morning the bed of Tithonos. As long as this expression was understood, I should say that the mythe was present; it was past when Tithonos had been changed into a son of Laomedon, a brother of Priamos, a prince of Troy. Then the saying, that Eos left his bed in the morning, be-

* Ἀφελῶς δ' ἔλαμψε Τίταν.—*Anakreontea*, 47.

came mythical, and had none but a conventional or traditional meaning. Then, as Tithonos was a prince of Troy, his son, the Ethiopian Memnon, had to take part in the Trojan war. And yet how strange!—even then the old mythe seems to float through the dim memory of the poet!—for when Eos weeps for her son, the beautiful Memnon, her tears are called 'morning-dew,'—so that the past may be said to have been still half-present.

As we have mentioned Kephalos as the beloved of Eos, and the father of Tithonos, we may add, that Kephalos also, like Tithonos and Endymion, was one of the many names of the Sun. Kephalos, however, was the rising sun—the head of light,—an expression frequently used of the sun in different mythologies. In the *Veda*, where the sun is addressed as a horse, the head of the horse is an expression meaning the rising sun. Thus, the poet says—*Rv.* i. 163, 6, 'I have known through my mind thy self when it was still far—thee, the bird flying up from below the sky; I saw a head with wings, proceeding on smooth and dustless paths.' The Teutonic nations speak of the sun as the eye of Wuotan, as Hesiod speaks of—

πάντα ἰδὼν Διὸς ὀφθαλμὸς καὶ πάντα νοήσας;

and they also call the sun the face of their god.* In the *Veda*, again, the sun is called (i. 115, 1) 'the face of the gods,' or the face of Aditi, (i. 113, 9); and it is said that the winds obscure the eye of the sun by showers of rain (v. 59, 5.)

A similar idea led the Greeks to form the name of Kephalos; and if Kephalos is called the son of Herse—the Dew,—this meant the same in mythological language, that we should express by the sun rising over dewy fields. What is told of Kephalos is, that he was the husband of Prokris, that he loved her, and that they vowed to be faithful to one another. But Eos also loves Kephalos; she tells her love, and Kephalos, true to Prokris, does not accept it. Eos, who knows her rival, replies, that he might remain faithful to Prokris, till Prokris had broken her vow. Kephalos accepts the challenge, approaches his wife disguised as a stranger, and gains her love. Prokris, discovering her shame, flies to Kreta. Here Diana gives her a dog and a spear, that never miss their aim, and Prokris returns to Kephalos disguised as a huntsman. While hunting with Kephalos, she is asked by him to give him the dog and the spear. She promises to do so only in return for his love, and when he

* Grimm, *Mythologie*, 666.

has assented, she discloses herself, and is again accepted by Kephalos. Yet Prokris fears the charms of Eos,—and while jealously watching her husband, she is killed by him unintentionally, by the spear that never misses its aim.

Before we can explain this mythe, which, however, is told with many variations by Greek and Latin poets, we must dissect it, and reduce it to its constituent elements.

The first is 'Kephalos loves Prokris.' Prokris we must explain by a reference to Sanskrit, where prush and prish mean, 'to sprinkle,' and are used chiefly with reference to rain-drops. For instance, *Rv.* i. 168, 8. 'The lightnings laugh down upon the earth, when the Winds shower forth the rain.'

The same root in the Teutonic languages has taken the sense of 'frost,'—and Bopp identifies prush with O. H. G. frus, frigere. In Greek we must refer to the same root πρώξ, πρωκός, a dewdrop, and also Prŏkris, the dew. Thus, the wife of Kephalos is only a repetition of Herse, her mother,—Herse, dew, being derived from Sk. vrish—to sprinkle. The first part of our mythe, therefore, means simply—'the Sun kisses the Morning Dew.'

The second saying is, 'Eos loves Kephalos.' This requires no explanation: it is the old story, repeated a hundred times in Arian mythology,—'the Dawn loves the Sun.'

The third saying was, 'Prokris is faithless; yet her new lover, though in a different guise, is still the same Kephalos.' This we may interpret as a poetical expression for the rays of the sun being reflected in various colours from the dew-drops,—so that Prokris may be said to be kissed by many lovers; yet they are all the same Kephalos, disguised, but at last recognised.

The last saying was, 'Prokris is killed by Kephalos,' *i.e.* the dew is absorbed by the sun. Prokris dies for her love to Kephalos, and he must kill her because he loves her. It is the gradual and inevitable absorption of the dew by the glowing rays of the sun which is expressed, with so much truth, by the unerring shaft of Kephalos thrown unintentionally at Prokris hidden in the thicket of the forest.*

We have only to put these four sayings together, and every poet will at once tell us the story of the love and jealousy of Kephalos, Prokris, and Eos. If anything was wanted to confirm the solar nature of Kephalos, we might

---

* La rugiada
Pugna col sole.—Dante, *Purgatorio*, I, 121.

point out how the first meeting of Kephalos and Prokris takes place on Mount Hymettos, and how Kephalos throws himself afterwards, in despair, into the sea, from the Leukadian mountains. Now, the whole mythe belongs to Attika, and here the sun would rise, during the greater part of the year, over Mount Hymettos like a brilliant head. A straight line from this, the most eastern point, to the most western headland of Greece, carries us to the Leukadian promontory,—and here Kephalos might well be said to have drowned his sorrows in the waves of the ocean.

Another magnificent sunset looms in the mythe of the death of Herakles. His twofold character as a god, and as a hero, is acknowledged even by Herodotos,—and some of his epithets are sufficient to indicate his solar character, though perhaps, no name has been made the vehicle of so many mythological and historical, physical and moral stories, as that of Herakles. Names which he shares with Apollo and Zeus are *Δαφνηφόρος, Αλεξίκακος, Μάντις, Ἰδαῖος, Ὀλύμπιος, Παγγενέτωρ.*

Now, in his last journey, Herakles also, like Kephalos, proceeds from east to west. He is performing his sacrifice to Zeus, on the Kenaeon promontory of Euboea, when Deianeira sends him the fatal garment. He then throws Lichas into the sea,—who is transformed into the Lichadian islands. From thence Herkales crosses over to Trachys, and then to Mount Oeta, where his pile is raised, and the hero is burnt, rising through the clouds to the seat of the immortal gods—himself henceforth immortal and wedded to Hebe, the goddess of youth. The coat which Deianeira sends to the solar hero is an expression frequently used in other mythologies; it is the coat which in the *Veda*, 'the mothers weave for their bright son,'—the clouds which rise from the waters and surround the sun like a dark raiment. Herakles tries to tear it off; his fierce splendour breaks through the thickening gloom—but fiery mists embrace him, and are mingled with the parting rays of the sun, and the dying hero is seen through the scattered clouds of the sky, tearing his own body to pieces, till at last his bright body is consumed in a general conflagration, his last-beloved being Iole—perhaps the violet-coloured evening clouds,—a word which, as it reminds us also of *ἰός*, poison (though the *ι* is long), may perhaps have originated the mythe of a poisoned garment.

In these legends the Greek language supplies almost all that is necessary in order to render these strange stories intelligible and rational, though the later Greeks,—I mean Homer and Hesiod, had certainly in most cases no suspicion of

the original import of their own traditions. But as there are Greek words which find no explanation in Greek, and which, without a reference to Sanskrit and the other cognate dialects, would have for ever remained to the philologist mere sounds with a conventional meaning, there are also names of gods and heroes inexplicable, from a Greek point of view, and which cannot be made to disclose their primitive character, unless confronted with contemporary witnesses from India, Persia, Italy, or Germany. Another mythe of the dawn will best explain this :—

Ahan in Sanskrit, is a name of the day, and is said to stand for dahan, like asru, tear, for dasru, Greek δάκρυ. Whether we have to admit an actual loss of this initial d, or whether the d is to be considered rather as a secondary letter, by which the root ah was individualised to dah, is a question which does not concern us at present. In Sanskrit we have the root dah, which means, to burn, and from which a name of the day might have been formed in the same manner as dyu—day, is formed from dyu, to be brilliant. Nor does it concern us here, whether the Gothic dags, day, is the same word or not. According to Grimm's law, daha, in Sanskrit, should in Gothic appear as taga, and not as daga. However, there are several of the old common Arian names in which Grimm's law is violated, and Bopp seems inclined to consider daga and daha identical in origin. Certain it is that the same root from which the Teutonic words for *day* are formed, has also given rise to the name for dawn. In German we say, —' der Morgen tagt,'—and in Old English day was dawe,—while to dawn was in Anglo-Saxon dagian. Now, in the *Veda,* one of the names of the dawn is Ahanâ. It occurs only once, *Rv.* i. 123, 4.

Gṛihám gṛiham Ahanâ' yâti ákkha
Divédive ádhi nâ'ma dádhânâ
Sísâsantí Dyotanâ' sásvat â' agât
A'gram agram ít bhagate vásûnâm.

' Ahanâ (the dawn) comes near to every house,—she who makes every day to be known.

' Dyotanâ (the dawn), the active maiden, comes back for evermore,—she enjoys always the first of all goods.'

We have already seen the Dawn in various relations to the Sun, but not yet as the beloved of the Sun, flying before her lover, and destroyed by his embrace. This, however, was a very familiar expression in the old mythological language of the Arians. The Dawn has died in the arms of the Sun, or the Dawn is flying before the Sun, or

the Sun has shattered the car of the Dawn, were expressions meaning simply, the sun has risen—the dawn is gone. Thus, we read in the *Rv.* iv. 30, in a hymn celebrating the achievements of Indra, the chief solar deity of the *Veda*—

'And this strong and manly deed also thou hast performed, O Indra, that thou struckest the daughter of Dyaus (the Dawn), a woman difficult to vanquish.

'Yes, even the daughter of Dyaus, the magnified, the Dawn, thou, O Indra, a great hero, hast ground to pieces.

'The Dawn rushed off from her crushed car, fearing that Indra, the bull, might strike her.

'This her car lay there well ground to pieces; she went far away.'

In this case, Indra behaves rather unceremoniously to the daughter of the sky; but, in other places, she is loved by all the bright gods of heaven, not excluding her own father. The Sun, it is said, *Rv.* i. 115, 2, follows her from behind, as a man follows a woman. 'She, the Dawn, whose cart is drawn by white horses, is carried away in triumph by the two Asvins,' —as the Leukippides are carried off by the Dioskuroi.

If now we translate, or rather transliterate, *Dahanâ* into Greek, Dáphne stands before us, and her whole history is intelligible. Daphne is 'young, and beautiful—Apollo loves her—she flies before him, and dies as he embraces her with his brilliant rays.' Or, as another poet of the *Veda* (x. 189), expresses it, 'The Dawn comes near to him—she expires as soon as he begins to breathe—the mighty one irradiates the sky.' Any one who has eyes to see and a heart to feel with nature like the poets of old, may still see Daphne and Apollo,—the dawn rushing and trembling through the sky, and fading away at the sudden approach of the bright sun. The metamorphosis of Daphne into a laurel-tree is a continuation of the mythe of peculiarly Greek growth. Daphne, in Greek, meant no longer the dawn, but it had become the name of the laurel. Hence the tree Daphne was considered sacred to the lover of Daphne, the dawn, and Daphne herself was fabled to have been changed into a tree when praying to her mother to protect her from the violence of Apollo.*

Without the help of the *Veda*, the name of Daphne and the legend attached to her, would have remained unintelligible, for the later Sanskrit supplies no key to this name. This shows the value of the *Veda* for the purpose of comparative mythology, a science which, without the *Veda*, would have remained

---

* Cf. *Rv.* iv. 30.

mere guesswork, without fixed principles and without a safe basis.

In order to show in how many different ways the same idea may be expressed mythologically, I have confined myself to the names of the Dawn. The dawn is really one of the richest sources of Arian mythology; and another class of legends, embodying the strife between winter and summer, the return of spring, the revival of nature, is in most languages but a reflection and amplification of the more ancient stories telling of the strife between night and day, the return of the morn, and the revival of the whole world. The stories, again, of solar heroes fighting through a thunderstorm against the powers of darkness, are borrowed from the same source; and the cows, so frequently alluded to in the *Veda*, as carried off by Vritra and brought back by Indra, are in reality the same bright cows which the Dawn drives out every morning to their pasture ground—the clouds—which, from their heavy udders, send down refreshing and fertilising rain or dew upon the parched earth. There is no sight in nature more elevating than the dawn even to us, whom philosophy has taught that 'nil admirari' is the highest wisdom. Yet in ancient times the power of admiring was the greatest blessing bestowed on mankind; and when could man have admired more intensely, when could his heart have been more gladdened and overpowered with joy than at the approach of

> the Lord of light,
> Of life, of love, and gladness!

The darkness of night fills the human heart with despondency and awe, and a feeling of fear and anguish sets every nerve trembling. There is man like a forlorn child fixing his eye with breathless anxiety upon the East, the womb of day, where the light of the world has flamed up so many times before. As the father waits the birth of his child, so the poet watches the dark heaving night who is to bring forth her bright son, the sun of the day. The doors of heaven seem slowly to open, and what are called the bright flocks of the Dawn step out of the dark stable, returning to their wonted pastures. Who has not seen the gradual advance of this radiant procession—the heaven like a distant sea tossing its golden waves—when the first rays shoot forth like brilliant horses racing round the whole course of the horizon—when the clouds begin to colour up, each shedding her own radiance over her more distant sisters! Not only the East, but the West, and the South, and the North, the whole temple of heaven is illuminated, and the pious worshipper lights in response his own small light on the

altar of the hearth, and stammers words which express but faintly the joy that is in nature and in the human heart—

'Rise! our life, our spirit is come back! the darkness is gone, the light approaches!'

If the people of antiquity called these eternal lights of heaven their gods, their bright ones (deva), the Dawn was the firstborn among all the gods—Protogeneia—dearest to man, and always young and fresh. But if not raised to an immortal state, if only admired as a kind being, awakening every morning the children of man, her life would seem to be short. She soon fades away, and dies when the fountain-head of light rises in naked splendour, and sends his first swift glance through the vault of heaven. We cannot realize that sentiment with which the eye of antiquity dwelt on these sights of nature. To us all is law, order, necessity. We calculate the refractory power of the atmosphere, we measure the possible length of the dawn in every climate, and the rising of the sun is to us no greater surprise than that two and two make four. But if we could believe again, that there was in the sun a being like our own, that in the dawn there was a soul open to human sympathy,—if we could bring ourselves to look for a moment upon these powers as personal, free, and adorable, how different would be our feelings at the blush of day! That Titanic assurance with which we say, the sun *must* rise, was unknown to the early worshippers of nature, or if they also began to feel the regularity with which the sun and the other stars perform their daily labour, they still thought of free beings kept in temporary servitude, chained for a time, and bound to obey a higher will, but sure to rise, like Herakles, to a higher glory at the end of their labours. It seems to us childish when we read in the *Veda* such expressions as, 'Will the Sun rise?' 'Will our old friend, the Dawn, come back again?' 'Will the powers of darkness be conquered by the God of Light?' And when the Sun rose, they wondered how, but just born, he was so mighty, and strangled, as it were, in his cradle, the serpents of the night. They asked how he could walk along the sky? why there was no dust on his road? why he did not fall backward? But at last they greeted him like the poet of our own time—

Hail, orient Conqueror of gloomy Night!

and the human eye felt that it could not bear the brilliant majesty of Him whom they call 'the Life, the Breath, the brilliant Lord and Father.'

Thus sunrise was the revelation of nature, awakening in the human mind that feeling of dependence, of helplessness, of

hope, of joy and faith in higher powers, which is the source of all wisdom, the spring of all religion. But if sunrise inspired the first prayers, called forth the first sacrificial flames, sunset was the other time when, again, the whole frame of man would tremble. The shadows of night approach, the irresistible power of sleep grasps man in the midst of his pleasures, his friends depart, and in his loneliness his thoughts turn again to higher powers. When the day departs, the poet bewails the untimely death of his bright friend, nay, he sees in his short career the likeness of his own life. Perhaps, when he has fallen asleep, his sun may never rise again, and thus the place to which the setting sun withdraws in the far West rises before his mind as the abode where he himself would go after death, where 'his fathers went before him,' and where all the wise and the pious rejoice in a 'new life with Yama and Varuna.' Or he might look upon the sun, not as a short-lived hero, but as young, unchanging, and always the same, while generations after generations of mortal men were passing away. And hence, by the mere force of contrast, the first intimation of beings which do not wither and decay—of immortals, of immortality! Then the poet would implore the immortal sun to come again, to vouchsafe to the sleeper a new morning. The god of day would become the god of time, of life and death. Again, the evening twilight, the sister of the dawn, repeating, though with a more sombre light, the wonders of the morning, how many feelings must it have roused in the musing poet—how many poems must it have elicited in the living language of ancient times! Was it the dawn that came again to give a last embrace to him who had parted from her in the morning? Was she the immortal, the always returning goddess, and he the mortal, the daily dying sun? Or was she the mortal, bidding a last farewell to her immortal lover, burnt, as it were, on the same pile which would consume her, while he would rise to the seat of the gods?

Let us express these simple scenes in ancient language, and we shall find ourselves surrounded on every side by mythology full of contradictions and incongruities, the same being represented as mortal or immortal, as man or woman, as the poetical eye of man shifts its point of view, and gives its own colour to the mysterious play of nature.

One of the mythes of the *Veda* which expresses this correlation of the Dawn and the Sun, this love between the Immortal and the Mortal, and the identity of the Morning Dawn and the Evening Twilight, is the story of Urvasî and Purûravas. The two names, Urvasî and Purûravas, are to the Hindu mere proper names, and even in the *Veda* their original meaning has almost entirely faded away. There is a dialogue in the

Rigveda between Urvasî and Purûravas, where both appear personified in the same manner as in the play of *Kalidâsa*. The first point, therefore, which we have to prove is that Urvasî was originally an appellation, and meant dawn.

The etymology of Urvasî is difficult. It cannot be derived from urva by means of the suffix *sa*,* as Dr. Kuhn proposes, because there is no such word as *urva*, and because derivatives in *sa*, like romasá, yuvasá, &c., have the accent on the last syllable. I therefore accept the common Indian explanation by which this name is derived from *uru*, wide, (εὐρυ) and a root, as, to pervade, and thus compare uru-asî, with another frequent epithet of the Dawn, urûkî, the feminine of uru-ak, far-going. It was certainly one of the most striking features, and one by which the Dawn was distinguished from all the other dwellers in the heavens, that she occupies the wide expanse of the sky, and that her horses ride, as it were, with the swiftness of thought round the whole horizon. Hence we find that names beginning with *uru* in Sanskrit, and with εὐρυ in Greek, are almost invariably old mythological names of the Dawn or the Twilight. The Earth also, it is true, claims this epithet, but in different combinations from those which apply to the bright goddess. Names of the Dawn are Euryphaessa, the mother of Helios, Eurykyde or Eurypyle, the daughter of Endymion, Eurymede, the wife of Glaukos, Eurynome, the mother of the Charites, and Eurydike, the wife of Orpheus, whose character as an ancient god will be discussed hereafter. In the *Veda* the name of Ushas or Eos, is hardly ever mentioned without some allusion to her far and wide spreading splendour; such as 'urviyâ vibhâti,' she shines wide; 'urviyâ vikákshe,' she looks far and wide; varîyasî, the widest,† whereas the light of the Sun is not represented as wide-stretching, but rather as far-darting.

But there are other indications besides the mere name of Urvasî, which lead us to suppose that she was originally the goddess of the dawn. Vasish*tha*, though best known as the name of one of the chief poets of the *Veda*, is the superlative of vasu, bright, and as such also a name of the Sun. Thus it happens

---

* *Pân.* v. 2, 100.

† The name which approaches nearest to Urvasî in Greek might seem to be *Europe*, because the palatal *s* is occasionally represented by a Greek π, as *asva* = ἵππος. The only difficulty is the long ω in Greek, otherwise Europe, carried away by the white bull (vrishâ, man, bull, stallion, in the *Veda* a frequent appellation of the sun, and *sveta*, white, applied to the same deity), carried away on his back (the dawn being frequently represented as at the back of the sun, of Eurydike); again carried to a distant cave (the gloaming of the evening;) and mother of *Apollo*, the god of daylight, of *Minos*, (Manu, a mortal Zeus,) would well agree with the goddess of the dawn.

that expressions which apply properly to the sun only, were transferred to the ancient poet. He is called the son of Mitra and Varu*n*a, night and day, an expression which has a meaning only with regard to Vasish*tha*, the sun; and as the sun is frequently called the offspring of the dawn, Vasish*tha*, the poet, is said to owe his birth to Urvasî. (*Rv.* vii. 31, 11.) The peculiarity of his birth reminds us strongly of the birth of Aphrodite, as told by Hesiod.

Again, we find that in the few passages where the name of Urvasî occurs in the *Rigveda*, the same attributes and actions are ascribed to her which usually belong to Ushas, the Dawn.

It is frequently said of Ushas, that she prolongs the life of man, and the same is said of Urvasî. (*Rv.* iv. 2, 18; v. 41, 19; x. 95, 10.) In one passage Urvasî is even used as a plural, in the sense of many dawns or days increasing the life of man, which shows that the appellative power of the word was not yet quite forgotten. Again, she is called antarikshaprâ, filling the air, a usual epithet of the sun, b*r*ihaddivâ, with mighty splendour, all indicating the bright presence of the dawn. However, the best proof that Urvasî was the dawn is the legend told of her and her love to Purûravas, a story that is true only of the Sun and the Dawn. That *Purûravas* is an appropriate name of a solar hero requires hardly any proof. Purûravas meant the same as πολυδευκης, 'endowed with much light;' for though rava is generally used of sound, yet the root ru, which means originally to cry, is also applied to colour,* in the sense of a loud or crying colour, *i.e.* red, (cf. rudhira, ἐρυθρός, ruber, rufus, Lith. rauda, O.H.G. rôt.) Besides, Purûravas calls himself Vasish*tha*, which, as we know, is a name of the Sun; and if he is called Aid*a*, the son of Idâ, the same name is elsewhere, (*Rv.* iii. 29, 3,) given to Agni, the fire.

Now the story, in its most ancient form, is found in the Brâhm*a*na of the *Yagurveda*. There we read:—

'Urvasî, a kind of fairy, fell in love with Purûravas, the son of Idâ, and when she met him, she said—'Embrace me three times a-day, but never against my will, and let me never see you without your royal garments.' In this manner she lived with him a long time. Then her former friends, the Gandharvas, said: 'This Urvasî has now dwelt a long time among mortals; let us see that she come back.' Now, there was a ewe, with two lambs, tied to the couch of Urvasî and Purûravas, and the Gandharvas stole one of them. Urvasî said: 'They take away my darling, as if I lived

* Thus it is said, *Rv.* vi. 3, 6, the fire cries with light, (*sok*ishâ) rarapitî; the two Spartan Charites are called Κλητά and Φαεννά, *i.e.* Clara, clear-sounding and clear-shining. Of the rising sun it is said in the *Veda*, 'the child cries.'

in a land where there is no hero and no man.' They stole the second, and she upbraided her husband again. Then Purûravas looked and said: 'How can that be a land without heroes or men where I am?' And, naked, he sprang up; he thought it too long to put on his dress. Then the Gandharvas sent a flash of lightning, and Urvasî saw her husband naked as by daylight. Then she vanished; 'I come back,' she said—and went. Then he bewailed his vanished love in bitter grief; and went near Kurukshetra. There is a lake there, called Anyata*h*plaksha, full of lotus flowers, and while the king walked along its border, the fairies were playing there in the water, in the shape of birds. And Urvasî discovered him, and said: 'That is the man with whom I dwelt so long.' Then her friends said: 'Let us appear to him.' She agreed, and they appeared before him. Then the king recognised her and said: 'Lo! my wife! stay, thou cruel in mind! let us now exchange some words! Our secrets, if they are not told now, will not bring us luck on any later day.' She replied: 'What shall I do with thy speech? I am gone like the first of the dawns. Purûravas, go home again! I am hard to be caught, like the wind.' He said, in despair: 'Then may thy former friend now fall down, never to rise again; may he go far, far away! May he lie down on the threshold of death, and may rabid wolves there devour him!' She replied: 'Purûravas, do not die! do not fall down! may no evil wolves devour thee! there is no friendship with women, their hearts are the hearts of wolves. When I walked among mortals under a different form—when I dwelt with thee, many nights during four autumns, I ate once a-day a small piece of butter—and even now I feel pleasure from it.' Thus, at last, her heart melted, and she said: 'Come to me the last night of the year, and thou shalt be with me for one night, and a son will be born to thee.' He went the last night of the year to the golden seats, and while he was alone, he was told to go up, and then they sent Urvasî to him. Then she said: 'The Gandharvas will to-morrow grant thee a wish; choose!' He said: 'Choose thou for me.' She replied: 'Say to them, let me be one of you.' Early the next morn, the Gandharvas gave him his choice; but when he said 'let me be one of you,' they said: 'That kind of sacred fire is not yet known to man, by which he could perform a sacrifice, and become one of ourselves.' They then initiated Purûravas in the mysteries of a certain sacrifice, and when he had performed it, he became himself one of the Gandharvas.'

This is the simple story, told in the Brâhmana, in order to show the importance of a peculiar rite; this rite of kindling the fire by friction being represented as the one by which Purûravas obtained immortality. The verses quoted in the story are taken from the *Rigveda*, where we find, in the last book, together with many strange relics of popular poetry, a dialogue between the two lovers. It consists of seventeen

verses, while the author of the Brâhmaṇa knew only fifteen. But in one of the verses which he quotes, Urvasî says, 'I am gone for ever, like the first of the dawns,' which shows a strange glimmering of the old mythe in the mind of the poet, and reminds us of the tears which the mother of Memnon shed over the corpse of her son, and which even by later poets are called morning dew. Again, in the fourth verse, Urvasî addressing herself, says: 'This person, (that is to say I) when she was wedded to him, O Dawn! she went to his house, and was embraced by him day and night.' Again, she tells Purûravas that he was created by the gods in order to stay the powers of darkness, (dasyuhatyâya) a task invariably ascribed to Indra and other solar beings. Even the names of the companions of Urvasî point to the dawn, and Purûravas says:

'When I, the mortal, threw my arms around those flighty immortals, they trembled away from me like a trembling doe, like horses that kick against the cart.'

No goddess is so frequently called the friend of man as the Dawn. 'She goes to every house,' (i. 123, 4); 'she thinks of the dwelling of man,' (i. 123, 1); 'she does not despise the small or the great,' (i. 124, 6); 'she brings wealth,' (i. 48, 1); 'she is always the same, immortal, divine,' (i. 124, 4; i. 123, 8); 'she does not grow old,' (i. 113, 15); 'she is the young goddess, but she makes man grow old,' (i. 92, 11.) Thus Purûravas called Urvasî 'the immortal among the mortals;' and, in his last verse, he addressed his beloved in the following words:

'I, the brightest Sun, I hold Urvasî, her who fills the air (with light), who spreads the sky. May the blessing of thy kind deed be upon thee! Come back, the heart burns me.'

Then the poet says:

'Thus the gods spake to thee, O son of Idâ: in order that thou, bound to death, mayest grow to be this (immortal), thy race should worship the gods with oblations! Then thou also wilt rejoice in heaven.'

We must certainly admit, that even in the *Veda*, the poets were as ignorant of the original meaning of Urvasî and Purûravas as Homer was of Tithonos, if not of Eos. To them they were heroes, indefinite beings, men yet not men, gods yet not gods. But to us, though placed at a much greater distance, they disclose their true meaning. As Wordsworth says:

> Not unrejoiced, I see thee climb the sky
> In naked splendour, clear from mist and haze—

Antiquity spoke of the naked sun, and of the chaste dawn hiding her face when she had seen her husband. Yet she says she will come again. And after the sun has travelled through

the world in search of his beloved, when he comes to the threshold of death and is going to end his solitary life, she appears again in the gloaming, the same as the dawn—as Eos in Homer begins and ends the day,—and she carries him away to the golden seats of the immortals.*

I have selected this mythe chiefly in order to show how ancient poetry is only the faint echo of ancient language, and how it was the simple story of nature which inspired the early poet, and held before his mind that deep mirror in which he might see reflected the passions of his own soul. For the heart of man, as long as it knows but its own bitterness, is silent and sullen. It does not tell its love and its loss. There may be a mute poetry in solitary grief, but *Mnemosyne*, the musing goddess of recollection, is not a muse herself, though she is the mother of the muses. It is the sympathy with the grief of others which first gives utterance to the poet's grief, and opens the lips of a silent despair. And if his pain was too deep and too sacred, if he could not compare it with the suffering of any other human heart, the ancient poet had still the heart of nature to commune with, and in her silent suffering he saw a noble likeness of what he felt and suffered within himself. When, after a dark night, the light of the day returned, he thought of his own light that would never rise again. When he saw the Sun kissing the Dawn, he dreamt of days and joys gone for ever. And when the Dawn trembled, and grew pale, and departed, and when the Sun seemed to look for her, and to lose her the more his brilliant eye sought her, an image would rise in his mind, and he would remember his own fate and yet forget it, while telling in measured words the love and loss of the Sun. Such was the origin of poetry. Nor was the evening without its charms. And when, at the end of a dreary day, the Sun seemed to die away in the far West, still looking for his Eastern bride, and suddenly the heavens opened, and the image of the Dawn rose again, her beauty deepened by a gloaming sadness—would not the poet gaze till the last ray had vanished, and would not the last vanishing ray linger in his heart, and kindle there a hope of another life, where he would find again what he had loved and lost?

> There is a radiant, though a short-lived flame,
> That burns for poets in the dawning east;
> And oft my soul has kindled at the same,
> When the captivity of sleep had ceased.

There is much suffering in nature to those who have eyes for

* *Od.* v. 390. ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ τρίτον ἦμαρ ἐϋπλόκαμος τέλεσ' ἠώς.

silent grief, and it is this tragedy—the tragedy of nature—which is the lifespring of all the tragedies of the ancient world. The idea of a young hero, whether he is called Baldr, or Sigurdr, or Sîfrit, or Achilles, or Meleager, or Kephalos, dying in the fulness of youth, a story so frequently told, localized, individualized, was first suggested by the Sun, dying in all his youthful vigour either at the end of a day, struck by the powers of darkness, or at the end of the sunny season, stung by the thorn of winter. Again, that fatal spell by which these sunny heroes must leave their first love, become unfaithful to her or she to them, was borrowed from nature. The fate of these solar heroes was inevitable, and it was their lot to die by the hand or by the unwilling treachery of their nearest friends or relatives. The Sun forsakes the Dawn, and dies at the end of the day, according to an inexorable fate, and bewailed by the whole of nature. Or the Sun is the Sun of Spring, who woos the Earth, and then forsakes his bride and grows cold, and is killed at last by the thorn of Winter. It is an old story, but it is for ever new in the mythology and the legends of the ancient world. Thus Baldr, in the Scandinavian *Edda*, the divine prototype of Sigurdr and Sîfrit, is beloved by the whole world. Gods and men, the whole of nature, all that grows and lives, had sworn to his mother not to hurt the bright hero. The mistletoe alone, that does not grow on the earth, but on trees, had been forgotten, and with it Baldr is killed at the winter solstice.

> So on the floor lay Balder, dead; and round
> Lay thickly strewn, swords, axes, darts, and spears,
> Which all the gods in sport had idly thrown
> At Balder, whom no weapon pierced or clove:
> But in his breast stood fixt the fatal bough
> Of mistletoe, which Lok, the accuser, gave
> To Hoder, and unwitting Hoder threw:
> 'Gainst that alone had Balder's life no charm.

Thus Isfendiyar, in the Persian epic, cannot be wounded by any weapon, yet it is his fate to be killed by a thorn, which, as an arrow, is thrown into his eye by Rustem. Rustem, again, can only be killed by his brother; Herakles, by the mistaken kindness of his wife; Sîfrit, by the anxious solicitude of Kriemhilt, or by the jealousy of Brunhilt, whom he had forsaken. He is vulnerable in one spot only, like Achilles, and it is there where Hagene (the thorn) strikes him. All these are fragments of solar mythes. The whole of nature was divided into two realms—the one dark, cold, wintry, and deathlike, the other bright, warm, vernal, and full of life. Sigurdr, as the solar hero is called in the *Edda*, the descendant of Odin, slays the serpent Fafnir, and conquers the treasure on which Andvari, the

dwarf, had pronounced his curse. This is the treasure of the Niflungar, the treasure of the earth which the nebulous powers of winter and darkness had carried away like robbers. The vernal sun wins it back, and like Demeter, rich in the possession of her restored daughter, the earth becomes rich again with all the treasures of spring. He then, according to the *Edda*, delivers Brynhildr, who had been doomed to a magic sleep after being wounded with a thorn by Odin, but who is now, like the spring after the sleep of winter, brought back to new life by the love of Sigurdr. But he, the lord of the treasure (vasupati) is driven onward by his fate. He plights his troth to Brynhildr, and gives her the fatal ring he had taken from the treasure. But he must leave her, and when he arrives at the castle of Gunnar, Gunnar's wife, Grimhildr, makes him forget Brynhildr, and he marries her daughter, Gudrun. Already his course begins to decline. He is bound to Gunnar, nay, he must conquer for him his former bride, Brynhildr, whom Gunnar now marries. Gunnar Gjukason seems to signify darkness, and thus we see that the awakening and budding spring is gone, carried away by Gunnar, like Proserpina by Pluto; like Sîtâ by Râvana. Gudrun, the daughter of Grimhildr, and sometimes herself called Grimhildr, whether the latter name meant summer (cf. gharma in Sanskrit), or the earth and nature in the latter part of the year, is a sister of the dark Gunnar, and though now married to the bright Sigurdr, she belongs herself to the nebulous regions. Gunnar, who has forced Sigurdr to yield him Brynhildr, is now planning the death of his kinsman, because Brynhildr has discovered in Sigurdr her former lover, and must have her revenge. Högni dissuades his brother, Gunnar, from the murder, but at last the third brother, Hödr, stabs Sigurdr while he is asleep at the winter solstice. Brynhildr has always loved him, and when her hero is killed she distributes the treasure, and is burnt, like Nanna, on the same pile with Sigurdr, a sword being placed between the two lovers. Gudrun also bewails the death of her husband, but she forgets him, and marries Atli, the brother of Brynhildr. Atli now claims the treasure from Gunnar and Högni, by right of his wife, and when they refuse to give it up, he invites them to his house, and makes them prisoners. Gunnar still refuses to reveal the spot where the treasure is buried till he see the heart of Högni, his brother. A heart is brought him, but it quivers, and he says, 'This is not the heart of my brother.' The real heart of Högni is brought at last, and Gunnar says, 'Now I alone know where the treasure lies, and the Rhine shall rather have it than I will give it up to thee.' He is then bound by Atli, and thrown among serpents. But even

the serpents he charms by playing on the harp with his teeth, till at last one viper crawls up to him, and kills him.

How much has this mythe been changed if we now read the story of the Nibelunge as it was written down at the end of the twelfth century in Germany. All the heroes are Christians, and have been identified with historical persons of the fourth, fifth, and sixth centuries. Gunther is localized in Burgundy, where we know that, in 435, a Gundicarius or Gundaharius happened to be a real king, the same who, according to Cassiodorus, was vanquished first by Aetius, and afterwards by the Huns of Attila. Hence Atli, the brother of Brynhildr, and the second husband of Gudrun (or Kriemhilt), is identified with Attila, the king of the Huns (453); nay, even the brother of Attila, Bleda, is brought in as Blödelin, the first who attacked the Burgundians, and was killed by Dankwart. Other historical persons were drawn into the vortex of the popular story, persons for whom there is no precedent at all in the Edda. Thus we find in the Nibelunge Dietrich von Bern, who is no other but Theodoric the Great (455—525), who conquered Odoacer in the battle of Ravenna (the famous Rabenschlacht), and lived at Verona, in German, Bern. Irenfried, again, the Landgrave of Thuringia, in the poem has been discovered to be Hermanfried, the King of Thuringia, married to Amalaberg, the niece of Theodoric. The most extraordinary coincidence, however, is that by which Sigurdr, the lover of Brynhildr, has been identified with Siegbert, King of Austrasia from 561 to 575, who was actually married to the famous Brunehault, who actually defeated the Huns, and was actually murdered under the most tragical circumstances by Fredegond, the mistress of his brother Chilperic. This coincidence between mythe and history is so great, that it has induced some euhemeristic critics to derive the whole legend of the Nibelunge from Austrasian history, and to make the murder of Siegbert by Brunehault the basis of the murder of Sîfrit or Sigurdr by Brynhildr. Fortunately, it is easier to answer these German than the old Greek euhemerists, for we find in contemporary history that Jornandes, who wrote his history at least twenty years before the death of the Austrasian Siegbert, knew already the daughter of the mythic Sigurdr, Swanhild, who was born, according to the *Edda*, after the murder of his father, and afterwards killed by Jörmunrekr, whom the poem has again historicised in Hermanicus, a Gothic king of the fourth century.

Let us now apply to the Greek mythes what we have learned from the gradual growth of the German mythe. There are evidently historical facts round which the mythe of Herakles has crystallized, only we cannot substantiate them so clearly as in the mythe of the Nibelunge, because we have there no

contemporaneous historical documents. Yet as the chief Herakles, is represented as belonging to the royal family of Argos, there may have been a Herakles, perhaps the son of a king, called Amphitryo, whose descendants, after a temporary exile, reconquered that part of Greece which had formerly been under the sway of Herakles. The traditions of the miraculous birth, of many of his heroic adventures, and of his death, were as little based on historical facts as the legends of Sîfrit. In Herakles killing the Chimæra and similar monsters, we see the reflected image of the Delphian Apollo killing the worm, or of Zeus, the god of the brilliant sky, with whom Hercules shares in common the names of Idaeos, Olympios, and Pangenetor. As the mythe of Sigurdr and Gunnar throws its last broken rays on the kings of Burgundy, and on Attila and Theodoric, the mythe of the solar Herakles was realized in some semi-historical prince of Argos and Mykenæ. Herakles may have been the name of the national god of the Heraklidæ, and this would explain the enmity of Hêrê, whose worship flourished in Argos before the Dorian immigration. What was formerly told of a god was transferred to Herakles, the leader of the Heraklidæ, the worshippers or sons of Herakles, while, at the same time, many local and historical facts connected with the Heraklidæ and their leaders may have been worked up with the mythe of the divine hero. The idea of Herakles being, as it were, the bond-servant of Eurystheus is of solar origin—it is the idea of the sun fettered to his work, and toiling for men, his inferiors in strength and virtue. Thus Sîfrit is toiling for Gunther, and even Apollo is for one year the slave of Laomedon—pregnant expressions, necessitated by the absence of more abstract verbs, and familiar even to modern poets:—

> As aptly suits therewith that modest pace
> Submitted to the chains
> That bind thee to the path which God ordains
> That thou shouldst trace.

The later growth of epic and tragical poetry may be Greek, or Indian, or Teutonic; it may take the different colours of the different skies, the different warmth of the different climes; nay, it may attract and absorb much that is accidental and historical. But if we cut into it and analyse it, the blood that runs through all the ancient poetry is the same blood; it is the ancient mythical speech. The atmosphere in which the early poetry of the Arians grew up was mythological, it was impregnated with something that could not be resisted by those who breathed in it. It was like the siren voice of the modern rhyme, which has suggested so many common ideas to poets writing in a common language.

We know what Greek and Teutonic poets have made of their epic heroes; let us see now whether the swarthy Hindu has been able to throw an equally beautiful haze around the names of his mythical traditions.

The story of the loves of Purûravas and Urvasî has frequently been told by Hindu poets. We find it in their epic poems, in their Purâṇas, and in the Brihat-kathâ, the *Great Story*, a collection of the popular legends of India. It has suffered many changes, yet even in Kalidâsa's* play, of which I shall give a short abstract, we recognise the distant background, and we may admire the skill with which this poet has breathed new life and human feeling into the withered names of a language long forgotten.

The first act opens with a scene in the Himâlaya mountains. The nymphs of heaven, on returning from an assembly of the gods, have been attacked, and are mourning over the loss of Urvasî, who has been carried off by a demon. King Purûravas enters on his chariot, and on hearing the cause of their grief, hastens to the rescue of the nymph. He soon returns, after having vanquished the robber, and restores Urvasî to her heavenly companions. But while he is carrying the nymph back to her friends in his chariot, he falls in love with her and she with him. He describes how he saw her slowly recovering from her terror:—

> She recovers, though but faintly.
> So gently steals the moon upon the night,
> Retiring tardily; so peeps the flame
> Of coming fires through smoky wreaths; and thus,
> The Ganges slowly clears her troubled wave,
> Engulphs the ruin that the crumbling bank
> Has hurled across her agitated course,
> And flows a clear and stately stream again.

When they part, Urvasî wishes to turn round once more to see Purûravas. She pretends that 'a straggling vine has caught her garland,' and, while feigning to disengage herself, she calls one of her friends to help her. Her friend replies—

> No easy task, I fear; you seem entangled
> Too fast to be set free: but, come what may,
> Depend upon my friendship.'

The eye of the King then meets that of Urvasî, and he exclaims,—

---

* Professor Wilson has given the first and most beautiful translation of this play in his *Hindu Theatre*. The original was published first at Calcutta, and has since been reprinted several times. A very useful edition has lately been published by Professor Williams.

A thousand thanks, dear plant, to whose kind aid
I owe another instant, and behold
But for a moment, and imperfectly,
Those half-averted charms.

In the second act we meet the King at Allahabad, his residence. He walks in the garden of the palace, accompanied by a Brahman, who acts the part of the gracioso in the Indian drama. He is the confidential companion of the King, and knows his love for Urvasî. But he is so afraid of betraying what must remain a secret to everybody at court, and in particular to the Queen, that he hides himself in a retired temple. There a female servant of the Queen discovers him, and 'as a secret can no more rest in his breast than morning dew upon the grass,' she soon finds out from him why the King is so changed since his return from the battle with the demon, and carries the tale to the Queen. In the meantime, the King is in despair, and pours out his grief—

Like one contending with the stream,
And still borne backwards by the current's force.

But Urvasî also is sighing for Purûravas, and we suddenly see her, with her friend, descending through the air to meet the king. Both are at first invisible to him, and listen to the confession of his love. Then Urvasî writes a verse on a birch-leaf, and lets it fall near the bower where her beloved reclines. Next, her friend becomes visible; and, at last, Urvasî herself is introduced to the King. After a few moments, however, both Urvasî and her friend are called back by a messenger of the gods, and Purûravas is left alone with his jester. He looks for the leaf on which Urvasî had first disclosed her love, but it is lost, carried away by the wind.

Breeze of the south, the friend of love and spring,
Though from the flower you steal the fragrant down
To scatter perfume, yet why plunder me
Of those dear characters, her own fair hand,
In proof of her affection, traced? Thou knowest,
The lonely lover that in absence pines,
Lives on such fond memorials.

But worse than this, the leaf is picked up by the Queen, who comes to look for the King in the garden. There is a scene of matrimonial upbraiding, and, after a while, her majesty goes off in a hurry, like a river in the rains. The King is doubly miserable, for though he loves Urvasî, he acknowledges a respectful deference for his queen. At last he retires.

'Tis past mid-day, exhausted by the heat,
The peacock plunges in the scanty pool,
That feeds the tall tree's root: the drowsy bee
Sleeps in the hollow chamber of the lotus,

Darkened with closing petals; on the brink
Of the now tepid lake the wild duck lurks
Amongst the sedgy shades; and, even here,
The parrot from his wiry bower complains,
And calls for water to allay his thirst.

At the beginning of the third act we are first informed of what befel Urvasî, when she was recalled to Indra's heaven. She had to act before Indra—her part was that of the goddess of Beauty, who selects Vishnu for her husband. One of the names of Vishnu is Purushottama, and poor Urvasî, when called upon to confess whom she loves, forgetting the part she has to act, says, 'I love Purûravas,' instead of 'I love Purushottama.' The author of the play was so much exasperated by this mistake, that he pronounced a curse upon Urvasî, that she should lose her divine knowledge. But when the performance was over, Indra observing her as she stood apart, ashamed and disconsolate, called her. The mortal who engrossed her thoughts, he said, had been his friend in the hours of peril; he had aided him in conflict with the enemies of the gods, and was entitled to his acknowledgements. She must, accordingly, repair to the monarch, and remain with him 'till he beholds the offspring she shall bear him.'

A second scene opens, in the garden of the palace. The King has been engaged in the business of the state, and retires as the evening approaches.

So ends the day, the anxious cares of state
Have left no interval for private sorrow.
But how to pass the night? its dreary length
Affords no promise of relief.

A messenger arrives from the Queen, apprising his majesty that she desires to see him on the terrace of the pavilion. The King obeys—and ascends the crystal steps while the moon is just about to rise, and the east is tinged with red.

King.—'Tis even so; illumined by the rays
Of his yet unseen orb, the evening gloom
On either hand retires, and in the midst
The horizon glows, like a fair face that smiles
Betwixt the jetty curls on either brow
In clusters pendulous. I could gaze for ever.

As he is waiting for the Queen, his desire for Urvasî is awakened again:—

In truth, my fond desire
Becomes more fervid as enjoyment seems
Remote, and fresh impediments obstruct
My happiness—like an impetuous torrent,
That, checked by adverse rocks, awhile delays
Its course, till high with chafing waters swollen

It rushes past with aggravated fury.
As spreads the moon its lustre, so my love
Grows with advancing night.

On a sudden Urvasî enters on a heavenly car, accompanied by her friend. They are invisible again, and listen to the King; but the moment that Urvasî is about to withdraw her veil, the Queen appears. She is dressed in white, without any ornaments; and comes to propitiate her husband, by taking a vow.

King.—In truth she pleases me. Thus chastely robed
In modest white, her clustering tresses decked
With sacred flowers alone, her haughty mien
Exchanged for meek devotion,—thus arrayed
She moves with heightened charms.

Queen.—My gracious lord, I would perform a rite,
Of which you are the object, and must beg you
Bear with the inconvenience that my presence
May for brief time occasion you.

King.—You do me wrong; your presence is a favour.
. . . . Yet trust me, it is needless
To wear this tender form, as slight and delicate
As the lithe lotus stem, with rude austerity.
In me behold your slave, whom to propitiate
Claims not your care,—your favour is his happiness.

Queen.—Not vain my vow, since it already wins me
My lord's complacent speech.

Then the Queen performs her solemn vow; she calls upon the god of the Moon—

Hear, and attest
The sacred promise that I make my husband!
Whatever nymph attract my lord's regard,
And share with him the mutual bonds of love,
I henceforth treat with kindness and complacency.

The Brahman (the confidential friend of the King), apart to Purûravas—The culprit that escapes before his hand is cut off determines never to run such a risk again. (Aloud) What then; is his majesty indifferent to your grace?

Queen.—Wise sir, how think you,—to promote his happiness
I have resigned my own. Does such a purpose
Prove him no longer dear to me?

King.—I am not what you doubt me; but the power
Abides with you: do with me as you will.
Give me to whom you please, or if you please,
Retain me still your slave.

Queen.—Be what you list;
My vow is plighted—nor in vain the rite,
If it afford you satisfaction. Come
Hence, girls; 'tis time we take our leave.

King.—Not so:
So soon to leave me is no mark of favour.
Queen.—You must excuse me; I may not forego
The duties I have solemnly incurred.

It does not bring out the character of the King under a very favourable light, that this scene of matrimonial reconciliation, when the Queen acts a part which we should hardly expect on an oriental stage, should be followed immediately by the apparition of Urvasî. She has been present, though invisible, during the preceding conversation between him and his Queen, and she now advances behind the King, and covers his eyes with her hands.

It must be Urvasî (the king says);
No other hand could shed such ecstasy
Through this emaciate frame. The solar ray
Wakes not the night's fair blossom; that alone
Expands when conscious of the moon's dear presence.*

Urvasî takes the resignation of the Queen in good earnest, and claims the King as granted her by right. Her friend takes leave, and she now remains with Purûravas as his beloved wife.

Urvasî.—I lament
I caused my lord to suffer pain so long.
King.—Nay, say not so! The joy that follows grief
Gains richer zest from agony foregone.
The traveller who, faint, pursues his track
In the fierce day, alone can tell how sweet
The grateful shelter of the friendly tree.

The next act is the gem of the whole play, though it is very difficult to imagine how it was performed without a *mise en scène* such as our modern theatres would hardly be able to afford. It is a melo-dramatic intermezzo, very different in style from the rest of the play. It is all in poetry, and in the most perfect and highly elaborate metres. Besides, it is not written in Sanskrit, but in Prakrit, the *lingua vulgaris* of India, poorer in form, but more melodious in sound than Sanskrit. Some of the verses are like airs to be performed by a chorus, but the stage directions which are given in the MSS. are so technical as to make their exact interpretation extremely difficult.

We first have a chorus of nymphs, deploring the fate of

* This refers to a very well-known legend. There is one lotus which expands its flower at the approach of the sun and closes them during night; while another, the beloved of the moon, expands them during night and closes them during day-time. We have a similar mythe of the *daisy*, the Anglo-Saxon *dæges eáge*, day's eye, Wordsworth's darling.

Urvasî. She had been living with the King in the groves of a forest, in undisturbed happiness.

Whilst wandering pleasantly along the brink
Of the Mandákini, a nymph of air,
Who gambolled on its sandy shore, attracted
The monarch's momentary glance,—and this
Aroused the jealous wrath of Urvasî.
Thus incensed
She heedlessly forgot the law that bars
All female access from the hateful groves
Of Kârtikeya. Trespassing the bounds
Proscribed, she suffers now the penalty
Of her transgression, and, to a slender vine
Transformed, there pines till time shall set her free.

Mournful strains are heard in the air—

Soft voices low sound in the sky,
Where the nymphs a companion deplore
And lament, as together they fly,
The friend they encounter no more.
So sad and melodious awakes
The plaint of the swan o'er the stream
When the red lotus blossoms, as breaks
On the wave the day's orient beam.

Amidst the lake where the lotus, shining,
Its flowers unfolds to the sunny beam,
The swan, for her lost companion pining,
Swims sad and slow o'er the lonely stream.

The King now enters, his features expressing insanity—his dress disordered. The scene represents a wild forest, clouds gathering overhead, elephants, deer, peacocks, and swans are seen. Here are rocks and waterfalls, lightning and rain. The King first rushes frantically after a cloud which he mistakes for a demon that carried away his bride.

Hold, treacherous friend; suspend thy flight—forbear:
Ah! whither wouldst thou bear my beauteous bride?
And now his arrows sting me; thick as hail,
From yonder peak, whose sharp top pierces heaven,
They shower upon me,
[*Rushes forward as to the attack, then pauses, and looks upwards.*]
It is no demon, but a friendly cloud,—
No hostile quiver, but the bow of Indra;
The cooling rain-drops fall, not barbed shafts,—
And I mistake the lightning for my love.

These raving strains are interrupted by airs, bewailing the fate of the separated lovers; but it is impossible to give an idea

of the real beauty of the whole, without much fuller extracts than we are able to give. The following passages may suffice:—

> Ah me! whatever I behold but aggravates
> My woe. These bright and pendulous flowers,
> Surcharged with dew, resemble those dear eyes,
> Glistening with starting tears. How shall I learn
> If she have passed this way?

He addresses various birds, and asks them whether they have seen his love, the peacock, 'the bird of the dark blue throat and eye of jet,'—the cuckoo, 'whom lovers deem Love's messenger,'—the swans, who are sailing northward, and 'whose elegant gait betrays that they have seen her,'—the *ċakravaka*, a bird who, during the night is himself separated from his mate,—but none give answer. Neither he, nor the bees who murmur amidst the petals of the lotus, nor the royal elephant, that reclines with his mate under the kadamba tree, has seen the lost one,—

> *King.*—From his companion he accepts the bough,
> Her trunk has snapped from the balm-breathing tree—
> How rich with teeming shoots and juicy fragrance.
> He crushes it.
> Deep on the mountain's breast,
> A yawning chasm appears—such shades are ever
> Haunts of the nymphs of air and earth. Perchance,
> My Urvaśî now lurks within the grotto,
> In cool seclusion. I will enter.—All
> Is utter darkness. Would the lightning's flash
> Now blaze to guide me— No, the cloud disdains—
> Such is my fate perverse—to shed for me
> Its many-channelled radiance. Be it so.
> I will retire—but first the rock address.
>
> *Air.*
>
> With horny hoofs and a resolute breast,
> The boar through the thicket stalks;
> He ploughs up the ground, as he plies his quest
> In the forest's gloomiest walks.
>
> Say, mountain, whose expansive slope confines
> The forest verge,—oh tell me, hast thou seen
> A nymph, as beauteous as the bride of love,
> Mounting, with slender frame, thy steep ascent,
> Or, wearied, resting in thy crowning woods?
> How! no reply? remote, he hears me not,—
> I will approach him nearer.
>
> *Air.*
>
> From the crystal summits the glistening springs
> Rush down the flowery sides,

And the spirit of heaven delightedly sings,
As among the peaks he hides.
Say, mountain so favoured,—have the feet
Of my fair one pressed this calm retreat?

Now, by my hopes, he answers! He has seen her:
Where is she?—say. Alas! again deceived.
Alone I hear the echo of my words,
As round the cavern's hollow mouth they roll,
And multiplied return. Ah, Urvasî!
Fatigue has overcome me. I will rest
Upon the borders of this mountain torrent,
And gather vigour from the breeze that gleans
Refreshing coolness from its gelid waves.
Whilst gazing on the stream, whose new swoln waters
Yet turbid flow, what strange imaginings
Possess my soul, and fill it with delight.
The rippling wave is like her arching brow;
The fluttering line of storks, her timid tongue;
The foamy spray, her white loose floating robe;
And this meandering course the current tracks,
Her undulating gait. All these recall
My soon-offended love. I must appease her . . . .
I'll back to where my love first disappeared.
Yonder the black deer couchant lies; of him
I will inquire. Oh, antelope, behold . . . .
How! he averts his gaze, as if disdaining
To hear my suit! Ah no, he, anxious, marks
His doe approach him; tardily she comes,
Her frolic fawn impeding her advance.

At last the King finds a gem, of ruddy radiance; it is the gem of Union, which, by its mighty spell, should restore Urvasî to her lover. He holds it in his hands, and embraces the vine, which is now transformed into Urvasî. The gem is placed on Urvasî's forehead, and the King and his heavenly Queen return to Allahabad.

Yonder cloud
Shall be our downy car, to waft us swift
And lightly on our way; the lightning's wave
Its glittering banners; and the bow of Indra (the rainbow)
Hangs as its over-arching canopy
Of variegated and resplendent hues.
[*Exeunt on the cloud. Music.*]

The fifth and last act begins with an unlucky incident. A hawk has borne away the ruby of re-union. Orders are sent to shoot the thief, and, after a short pause, a forester brings the jewel and the arrow by which the hawk was killed. An inscription is discovered on the shaft, which states that it

belonged to Ayus, the son of Urvasî and Purûravas. The King is not aware that Urvasî has ever borne him a son; but while he is still wondering, a female ascetic enters, leading a boy with a bow in his hand. It is Ayus, the son of Urvasî, whom his mother confided to the pious *K*yavana, who educated him in the forest, and now sends him back to his mother. The King soon recognises Ayus as his son. Urvasî also comes to embrace him:

> Her gaze intent
> Is fixed upon him, and her heaving bosom
> Has rent its veiling scarf.

But why has she concealed the birth of this child? and why is she now suddenly bursting into tears? She tells the King herself,

> When for your love I gladly left the courts
> Of heaven, the Monarch thus declared his will:
> 'Go, and be happy with the prince, my friend;
> But when he views the son that thou shalt bear him,
> Then hitherward direct thy prompt return.' . . . .
> The fated term expires, and to console
> His father for my loss, he is restored.
> I may no longer tarry.

King.—The tree that languished in the summer's blaze
Puts forth, reviving, as young rain descends,
Its leafy shoots, when lo! the lightning bursts
Fierce on its top, and fells it to the ground.

Urvasî.—But what remains for me? my task on earth
Fulfilled. Once gone, the King will soon forget me.

King.—Dearest, not so. It is no grateful task
To tear our memory from those we love.
But we must bow to power supreme: do you
Obey your lord; for me, I will resign
My throne to this my son, and with the deer
Will henceforth mourn amidst the lonely woods.

Preparations are made for the inauguration of the young king, when a new *deus ex machina* appears—Narada, the messenger of Indra.

Messenger.—May your days be many! King, attend:
The mighty Indra, to whom all is known,
By me thus intimates his high commands.
Forego your purpose of ascetic sorrow,
And Urvasî shall be through life united
With thee in holy bonds.

After this all concludes happily. Nymphs descend from heaven with a golden vase containing the water of the heavenly

Ganges, a throne, and other paraphernalia, which they arrange. The Prince is inaugurated as partner of the empire, and all go together to pay their homage to the Queen, who had so generously resigned her rights in favour of Urvasî, the heavenly nymph.

Here, then, we have the full flower, whose stem we trace through the Purâ*n*as and the Mahâbhârata to the Brâhma*n*as and the *Veda*, while the seed lies buried deep in that fertile stratum of language from which all the Arian dialects draw their strength and nourishment. Mr. Carlyle had seen deep into the very heart of mythology when he said—'Thus, though tradition may have but one root, it grows, like a banian, into a whole overarching labyrinth of trees.' The root of all the stories of Purûravas and Urvasî, were short proverbial expressions, of which ancient dialects are so fond. Thus—'Urvasî loves Purûravas,' meant 'the sun rises;' 'Urvasî sees Purûravas naked,' meant 'the dawn is gone;' 'Urvasî finds Purûravas again,' meant 'the sun is setting.' The names of Purûravas and Urvasî are of Indian growth, and we cannot expect to find them identically the same in other Arian dialects. But the same ideas pervade the mythological language of Greece. There one of the many names of the dawn was Eurydike (p. 61). The name of her husband is, like many Greek words, inexplicable, but Orpheus is the same word as the Sanskrit *Ri*bhu or Arbhu, which, though it is best known as the name of the three *Ri*bhus, was used in the *Veda* as an epithet of Indra, and a name of the sun. The old story then, was this:—'Eurydike is bitten by a serpent, (*i.e.* by the night), she dies, and descends into the lower regions. Orpheus follows her, and obtains from the gods that his wife should follow him if he promised not to look back. Orpheus promises,—ascends from the dark world below; Eurydike is behind him as he rises, but, drawn by doubt or by love, he looks round;—the first ray of the sun glances at the dawn, and the dawn fades away.' There may have been an old poet of the name of Orpheus,—for old poets delight in solar names; but, whether he existed or not, certain it is, that the story of Orpheus and Eurydike was neither borrowed from a real event, nor invented without provocation. In India also, the mythe of the *Ri*bhus has taken a local and historical colouring by a mere similarity of names. A man,—or a tribe of the name of Bribu (*Rv.* vi. 46, 29)* was admitted

* This explains the passage in *Manu*, x. 107, and shows how it ought to be corrected.

into the Brahmanic community. They were carpenters, and had evidently rendered material assistance to Bharadvâga. As they had no Vaidik gods, the *R*ibhus were made over to them, and many things were ascribed to these gods which originally applied only to the mortal Bribus. These historical realities will never yield to a mythological analysis, while the truly mythological answers at once if we only know how to test it. There is a grammar by which this ancient dialect can be translated into the common language of the Arians.

I must come to a close; but it is difficult to leave a subject in which, as in an arch, each stone by itself threatens to fall, while the whole arch would stand the strongest pressure. One mythe more.—We have seen how the sun and the dawn have suggested so many expressions of love, that we may well ask, did the Arian nations, previous to their separation, know the most ancient of the gods, the god of Love? Was *Eros* known at that distant period of awakening history, and what was meant by the name by which the Arians called him? The common etymology derives Eros from a Sanskrit root, vri or var, which means to choose, to select.

Now, if the name of Love had first been coined in our ball-rooms, such an etymology might be defensible, but surely the idea of weighing, comparing, and prudently choosing could not have struck a strong and genuine heart as the most prominent feature of love. Let us imagine, as well as we can, the healthy and strong feelings of a youthful race of men, free to follow the call of their hearts,—unfettered by the rules and prejudices of a refined society, and controlled only by those laws which nature and the graces have engraved on every human heart. Let us imagine such hearts suddenly lighted up by love,—by a feeling of which they knew not either whence it came and where it would carry them; an impulse they did not even know how to name. If they wanted a name for it, where could they look? Was not love to them like an awakening from sleep? Was it not like a morn radiating with heavenly splendour over their souls—pervading their hearts with a glowing warmth—purifying their whole being with a fresh breeze, and illuminating the whole world around them with a new light? If it was so, there was but one name by which they could express love,—there was but one similitude for the roseate bloom that betrays the dawn of love—it was the blush of the day,—the rising of the sun. 'The sun has risen,' they said, where we say 'I love;' 'the sun has set,' they said, where we say, 'I have loved.'

And this, which we might have guessed, if we could but throw off the fetters of our own language, is fully confirmed by an analysis of ancient speech. The name of the dawn in Sk. is ushas, the Greek Ἑως, both feminine. But the *Veda* knows also a masculine dawn, or rather a dawning sun (Agni aushasya, Ἑως), and in this sense Ushas might be supposed to have taken in Greek the form of Ἑρως. S is frequently changed into r. In Sanskrit it is a general rule that s followed by a media becomes r. In Greek we have the Lakonic forms in ορ instead of ος (Ahrens, D. D. § 8); in Latin, an r between two vowels often exists in ancient inscriptions under the more original form of s (asa=ara). The very word ushas has in Latin taken the form of aurora, which is derived from an intermediate auros, auroris, like flora, from flos, floris.

But, however plausible such analogies may seem, it is only throwing dust in our eyes if comparative philologists imagine they can establish in this manner the transition of a Sanskrit sh into a Greek r. No, whatever analogies other dialects may exhibit, no Sanskrit sh between two vowels has ever as yet been proved to be represented by a Greek r. Therefore Eros cannot be Ushas.

And yet Eros is the dawning sun. The sun in the *Veda* is frequently called the runner, the quick racer, or simply the horse, while in the more humanized mythology of Greece, and also in many parts of the *Veda*, he is represented as standing on his cart, which in the *Veda* is drawn by two, seven, or ten horses, while in Greek we also have the quadriga:

Ἅρματα μὲν τάδε λαμπρὰ τεθρίππων
Ἥλιος ἤδη λάμπει κατὰ γῆν.

These horses are called Haritas; they are always feminine. They are called bhadrâs, happy or joyful (i. 115, 3); *k*itrâ's, many-coloured (i. 115, 3); gh*r*itasnâs, bathed in dew (iv. 6, 9); sva*nk*as, with beautiful steps; vîtapr*i*shth*â*s, with lovely backs (v. 45, 10.) Thus we read—

Rv. ix. 63, 9.—The Sun has yoked the ten Harits for his journey.
Rv. i. 50, 8.—May the seven Harits bring the bright sun on thy cart.
Rv. iv. 13, 3.—The seven Harits bring him, the Sun, the spy of the world.

In other passages, however, they take a more human form, and as the Dawn which is sometimes called simply asvâ, the mare, is well known by the name of the sister, these Harits also are called the Seven Sisters, (vii. 66, 5); and in one passage (ix. 86, 37) they appear as 'the Harits with beautiful wings.' After this I need hardly say that we have here the prototype of the Grecian *Charites*.

I should like to follow the track which this recognition of the Charites, as the Sanskrit Haritas, opens to Comparative Mythology; but I must return to Eros, in whose company they so frequently appear. If, according to the laws which regulate the metamorphosis of common Arian words as adopted by Greek or Sanskrit, we transliterate ἔρως into Sanskrit, we find that its derivative suffix ως, ωτος, is the same as the termination of the participle of the perfect, and corresponds, therefore, to the Sanskrit vant; nom. vâ (for vân), gen. vatas. There being no short e in Sanskrit, and a Greek ρ corresponding to a Sanskrit r, Ἔρως, ἔρωτος, if it existed at all in Sanskrit, would have had the form of A'rvân, árvatas. Now árvan in the later Sanskrit means only a horse, but in the *Veda* it has retained more of its radical power, and is used in the sense of quick, running, vehement. It is frequently applied to the Sun, so that in some passages it stands as the name of the Sun, while in others it is used as a substantive, meaning horse or rider. Thus, through the irresistible influence of the synonymous character of ancient language, and without any poetical effort on the part of the speaker, those who spoke of the sun as arvan, spoke at the same time of a horse or rider. The word arvan, though intended only to express the rapid sun, set other ideas vibrating which gradually changed the sun into a horse or a horseman. Arvan means *horse* in passages like i. 91, 20,—

The god Soma gives us the cow; Soma gives us the quick horse; Soma gives a strong son.

It means horseman, *Rv.* i. 132, 5,—

The rider is born without a horse, without a bridle.

The rider who is meant here is the rising sun, and there is a whole hymn addressed to the sun as a horse. Nay, the growth of language and thought is so quick, that in the *Veda* the mythe turns, so to speak, back upon itself; and one of the poets (i. 163, 21) praises the bright Vasus, because 'out of the sun they have wrought a horse.' Thus árvan becomes by itself, without any adjective or explanation, the name for sun, like sûrya, âditya, or any other of his old titles. *Rv.* i. 163, 3, the poet tells the sun, 'Thou, O Arvan (horse), art Aditya,' (the sun); and (vi. 12, 6), Agni, or the sun, is invoked by the same name: 'Thou, O Arvan, keep us from evil report! O Agni, lighted with all the fires! thou givest treasures, thou sendest away all evils; let us live happy for hundred winters; let us have good offspring.'

Before we can show how the threads of this name of the Sun in India enters into the first woof of the god of Love in

Greece, we have still to observe that sometimes the horses, *i.e.* the rays of the sun, are called not only Harítas, but rohítas and árushis. *Rv.* i. 14, 12, 'Yoke the A'rushîs to thy cart, O bright Agni! the Haríts, the Rohíts! with them bring the gods to us!' These names may have been originally mere adjectives, meaning white, bright, and brown,* but they soon grew into names of certain animals belonging to the gods, according to their different colour and character. Thus, we read,—

Rv. ii. 10, 2.—Hear thou the brilliant Agni, my prayer; whether the two black horses (*syâvâ*) bring thy cart, or the two brown (róhítâ), or the two white horses (arushâ).

And again,—

Rv. vii. 42, 2.—Yoke the Haríts and the Rohíts, or the Arushás which are in thy stable.

As árvat was used for horse, árushî is used for cow; for instance, viii. 55, 3, where a poet says he has received four hundred cows (árushî*n*âm *k*âtu*h* satám). These árushîs or bright cows, belong more particularly to the Dawn, and instead of saying 'the day dawns,' the old poets of the *Veda* say frequently, 'the bright cows return,' (*Rv.* i. 92, 1). We found that the Harits were sometimes changed into seven sisters, and thus the A'rushîs also, originally the bright cows, underwent the same metamorphosis—

Rv. x. 5, 5.—The seven sisters, the A'rushîs, (the bright cows) knew of the sun: or, (x. 8, 3,)—When the sun flew up the A'rushîs refreshed their bodies in the water.

Sanskrit scholars hardly need to be told that this árushî is in reality the feminine of arvâ, or arvân, though there is also another form of the feminine, árvatî. As vidvâ'n, knowing, forms its feminine vidúshî, (*k*ikitvâ'n, *k*ikitúshî) so árvâ(*n*) makes árushî, a form which fully explains the formation of the feminine of the past participle in Greek. This may be shown by the following equation: vidvâ'n : vidúshî = εἰδώς : εἰδυῖα. The transition of árvâ into árushî is important for our purpose, because it throws new light on the origin of another word derived from aryat, the sun; and this is arushá, a masculine, and in the *Veda* again, one of the most frequent epithets or names of the sun. Arushá, gen. àsya, follows the weak declension, and is formed like διάκτορος, ου, instead of διάκτωρ, ορος; like Lat.

* Poi che l'altro mattin la bella Aurora
L'aer seren fe' bianco e rosso e giallo.—*Ariosto*, xxiii. 52.
Si che le bianche e le vermiglie guance,
Là dove io era, della bella Aurora
Per troppa etate divenivan rance.—Dante, *Purgatorio*, ii. 7.

vasum, i, instead of *vas, vasis;* like Prakrit *k*aranteshu instead of *k*aratsu, like Mod. Greek *ἡ νύκτα*, instead of *ἡ νύξ*. Sanskrit scholars will best understand this by the following equation:—

árvâ (running): árus: arushá = párva (knot): párus: parushá.

This arushá, as used in the *Veda*, brings us as near to the Greek Eros as we can expect; for arushá is used in the sense of bright—

Rv. vii. 75, 6.—The bright spotted horses are seen bringing to us the brilliant Dawn.

The horses* of Indra, of Agni, of Brihaspati, as quick as the wind, and as bright as suns, who lick the udder of the dark cow, the night, are called arushá; the smoke which rises from the burning sun at daybreak, the limbs of the sun with which he climbs the sky, the thunderbolt which Indra throws, the fire which is seen by day and by night, all are called arushá. 'He who fills heaven and earth with light, who runs across darkness along the sky, who is seen among the black cows of the night,' he is called arushá or the bright bull (arushó vríshâ.)

But this very *Arusha* is in the *Veda*, as in Greek mythology, represented as a child:—

Rv. iii. 1, 4.—The Seven Sisters have nursed him, the joyful, the white one, as he was born, Arusha, with great might; as horses go to the foal that is born, so did the gods bring up the sun when he was born.

Arusha is always the young sun in the *Veda;* the sun who drives away the dark night, and sends his first rays to awaken the world:—

Rv. vii. 71, 1.—Night goes away from her sister Dawn, the dark one opens the path for Arusha.

Though in some of his names there is an unintentional allusion to his animal character, he soon takes a purely human form. He is called Nri*k*akshâs (iii. 15, 3), 'having the eyes of a man,' and even his wings, as Grimm† will be glad to learn, have commenced to grow, in the *Veda*, where once (v. 47, 3) he is called 'Arushá*h* supar*n*ás,' 'the bright sun with beautiful wings.'

Τὸν δ' ἤτοι θνητοὶ μὲν Ἔρωτα καλοῦσι ποτηνόν,
Ἀθάνατοι δε Πτέρωτα, διὰ πτεροφύτορ' ἀνάγκην.

As Eros is the child of Zeus, Arusha is called the child of Dyaus (Diváh *sísus*).

Rv. vii. 15, 6.—Him, the god Agni, they adorn and purify every day

* Arusha, si voisin d'Aru*n*a (cocher du soleil), et d'Arus (le soleil), se retrouve en Zend sous la forme d'Aurusha (dont Anquetil fait Eorosh, l'oiseau), les chevaux qui trainent Serosh.—Burnouf, *Bhag. Pur.* LXXIX.

† See Jacob Grimm's *Essay on the God of Love.*

like a horse that has run his race,—like Arushá, the bright sun, the young child of Dyaus (heaven).

Rv. vi. 49, 2.—Let us worship Agni, the child of heaven, the son of strength, Arushá, the bright light of the sacrifice.

This child is the first of the gods, for he comes (v. 1, 5) 'agre ahnâm,' at the point of the days; 'ushasâm agre,' (x. 45, 7) at the beginning of the dawns; but in one passage two daughters are ascribed to him—different in appearance,—the one decked with the stars, the other brilliant by the light of the sun—Day and Night, who are elsewhere called the daughters of the Sun. As the god of Love, in the Greek sense of the word, Arusha does not occur, neither has love, as a mere feeling, been deified in the *Veda* under any name. Kâma, who is the god of Love in the later Sanskrit, never occurs in the *Veda* with personal or divine attributes, except in one passage of the 10th book, and here love is rather represented as a power of creation than as a personal being. But there is one other passage in the *Veda*, where Kâma, love, is clearly applied to the rising sun. The whole hymn, (ii. 38, 6) is addressed to Savitar, the sun. It it said, 'he rises as a mighty flame,—he stretches out his wide arms,—he is even like the wind. When he stops his horses, all activity ceases, and the night follows in his track. But before she has half finished her weaving, the sun rises again. Then Agni goes to all men and to all houses; his light is powerful, and his mother, the Dawn, gives him the best share, the first worship among men.' Then the poet goes on:—

He came back, with wide strides, longing for victory; the love of all men came near. The eternal approached, leaving the work (of Night) half-done; he followed the command of the heavenly Savitar.

'The love of all men,' may mean he who is loved by all men, or who grants their wishes to all men; yet I do not think it is by accident that Kâma, love, is thus applied to the rising sun.

Nor was the original solar character of the god of Love, the beloved of the Dawn, forgotten even in the later traditions of the Purâṇas. For we find that one of the names given to the son of Kâma, to Aniruddha, the irresistible (*ἀνίκατος μάχαν*), is Ushâpati, the lord of the Dawn.

If we place clearly before our mind all the ideas and allusions which have clustered round the name of Arvat and Arusha in the *Veda*, the various mythes told of Eros, which at first seem so contradictory, become perfectly intelligible. He is in Hesiod the oldest of the gods, born when there is as yet only Chaos and Earth. Here we have 'Arusha born at the begin-

ning of all the days.' He is the youngest of the gods, the son of Zeus, the friend of the Charites, also the son of the chief Charis, Aphrodite, in whom we can hardly fail to discover a female Eros (an Ushâ instead of an Agni aushasya). Every one of these mythes finds its key in the *Veda*. He is there 'the child, the son of Dyaus; he yokes the Harits, and is, if not the son,* at least the beloved of the dawn.' Besides, in Greek mythology also, Eros has many fathers and many mothers; and one pair of parents given him by Sappho, Heaven and Earth, is identical with his Vaidik parents, Dyaus and Idâ. India, however, is not Greece, and though we may trace the germs and roots of Greek words and Greek ideas to the rich soil of India, the full flower of Arian language, of Arian poetry and mythology, belongs to Hellas, where Plato has told us what Eros is, and where Sophokles sang his

> Ἔρως ἀνίκατε μάχαν,
> Ἔρως, ὃς ἐν κτήμασι πίπτεις
> ὃς ἐν μαλακαῖς παρειαῖς
> νεάνιδος ἐννυχεύεις·
> φοιτᾷς δ' ὑπέρπόντιος, ἐν τ'
> ἀγρονόμοις αὐλαῖς·
> καί σ' οὔτ' ἀθανάτων φύξιμος οὐδείς
> οὔθ' ἁμερίων ἐπ' ἀν-
> θρώπων· ὁ δ' ἔχων μέμηνεν.†

If Hegel calls the discovery of the common origin of Greek and Sanskrit the discovery of a new world, the same may be said with regard to the common origin of Greek and Sanskrit mythology. The discovery is made, and the science of comparative mythology will soon rise to the same importance as comparative philology. I have here explained but a few mythes, but they all belong to one small cycle, and many more names might have been added. I may refer those who take an interest in the geology of language to the *Journal of Comparative Philology*, published by my learned friend, Dr. Kuhn, at Berlin, who, in his periodical, has very properly admitted comparative mythology as an integral part of comparative philology, and who has himself discovered some striking parallelisms between the traditions of the *Veda* and the mythological names of the other Arian nations. The very 'Hippokentaurs and the Chimæra, the Gorgons and Pegasos, and other monstrous creatures,' have been set right; and though I do not hold Dr.

---

* Cf. Maxim. Tyr. XXIV., τὸν Ἔρωτά φησιν ἡ Διοτίμα τῷ Σωκράτει οὐ παῖδα, ἀλλ' ἀκόλουθον τῆς Ἀφροδίτης καὶ θεράποντα εἶναι. See Preller, *Greek Mythology*, p. 238.

† *Antigone*, 750.

Kuhn's views on many points, and particularly with regard to the elementary character of the gods, which he, like Lauer, the lamented author of the *System of Greek Mythology*, connects too exclusively with the fleeting phenomena of clouds, and storms, and thunder, while I believe their original conception to have been almost always solar, yet there is much to be learnt from both, even where we cannot agree with their conclusions. Much, no doubt, remains to be done, and even with the assistance of the *Veda*, the whole of Greek mythology will never be deciphered and translated. But can this be urged as an objection? There are many Greek words of which we cannot find a satisfactory etymology, even by the help of Sanskrit. Are we therefore to say that the whole Greek language has no etymological organization? If we find a rational principle in the formation of but a small portion of Greek words, we are justified in inferring that the same principle which manifests itself in part governed the organic growth of the whole; and though we cannot explain the etymological origin of all words, we should never say that language had no etymological origin, or that etymology 'treats of a past which was never present.' That the later Greeks, such as Homer and Hesiod, ignored the λόγος of their μύθοι I fully admit, but they equally ignored the real origin (τὸ ἔτυμον) of their words. What applies to etymology, therefore, applies with equal force to mythology. It has been proved by comparative philology that there is nothing irregular in language, and what was formerly considered as irregular in declension and conjugation is now recognised as the most regular and primitive formation of grammar. The same, we hope, may be accomplished in mythology, and instead of deriving it, as heretofore, 'ab ingenii humani imbecillitate et a dictionis egestate,' it will obtain its truer solution, 'ab ingenii humani sapientia et a dictionis abundantia.' Mythology is only a dialect, an ancient form of language. Mythology, though chiefly concerned with nature, and here again mostly with those manifestations which bear the character of law, order, power, and wisdom impressed on them, was applicable to all things. Nothing is excluded from mythological expression; neither morals nor philosophy, neither history nor religion, have escaped the spell of that ancient sibyl. But mythology is neither philosophy, nor history, nor religion, nor ethics. It is, if we may use a scholastic expression, a *quale*, not a *quid*—something formal, not something substantial, and, like poetry, sculpture, and painting, applicable to nearly all that the ancient world could admire or adore.

M. M.

THE GROWTH OF LAWS AND USAGES OF WAR.

THE object of this essay is not to analyze or enumerate the usages of war, but to obtain something like a general view, though of course a rough and imperfect one, of their progressive growth. Very imperfect it must necessarily be, for the subject is one which spreads over a large field, has flowed from many sources, and resists, by its fluctuating and uncertain nature, the systematizing influence of time. These are laws without sanctions, arising amidst a state of things to which the very idea of mutual obligation is incongruous and strange, —usages whose formation has been constantly checked and distorted by the passions of men and the jealousies and animosities of nations. But brought, as we have lately been, after long disuse, into the actual presence of war—seeing its living features and every movement of its march with wonderful vividness and detail, one is naturally and constantly tempted to cast a glance backward, and to compare it both with what it formerly was and with what it might be expected to be in that milder atmosphere of civilization which pervades our own times. No one, I suppose, can have witnessed the long succession of stirring and affecting scenes of which our memories are full,—the battles, bombardments, sieges,—the movements of armies, leaving rifled houses and gardens, and sometimes smoking ruins, behind them—the wholesale destruction of the means of subsistence on coasts inhabited by fishermen and peasants,—the countless miseries, calamities, crimes, which hover in the train of this great scourge of God,—without sometimes anxiously asking himself not only whether the war was just, but whether it was being waged as war should be waged by an educated and Christian nation.

The question has a speculative as well as a practical interest. Forty years of peace, during which the inventive and constructive faculties have been stimulated to the utmost, have altered the face of society, and the change has been such as to

make the contrast sharper and the plunge more abrupt. We live in times not of excessive luxury, but of elaborate comfort and ease, of order in things great and small, of vast mechanical enterprizes, diffused though superficial knowledge, fluent benevolence, and tolerably active charity. We have attained remarkable success in avoiding and putting out of sight all that would hurt the bodily senses or distress the mind. The current of thought among good men and their disciples and imitators sets in the direction of social improvement. The prejudices and antipathies of race are smoothed down, the ties of country and home weakened; and we have accustomed ourselves to divide society into classes rather than into peoples, and to study the component strata more than the superficial plan. At the same time, the extension of trade has knit closer the mutual dependence of nations, so that the stoppage of a single avenue of intercourse, the smallest rise in the price of any necessary article, is felt with electric rapidity in places most remote from each other. As all these things seemed to remove indefinitely the danger of war, so it was reasonable to expect that they would modify its character when it came.

The student of history is apt to be a little puzzled by frequent cursory references to 'laws,' with which he is tacitly assumed to be familiar. The Duke of Wellington directs that a French garrison shall be decimated, and all its officers put to the sword, if it should violate the laws of war by destroying works which it cannot maintain. The laws of war forbid the defence of an unfortified town; they permit a ship to hoist false colours at sea, though not to fire under them; they do not prohibit bribery and intrigue. What are these laws? Where are they written? What authority do they command? They are a body of usages, for the most part traditional, which have arisen principally from reasons of convenience, assisted by those instincts of humanity and justice which belong to man in a natural (that is, a social) state, by the sense of military honour, the progress of civilization, and the extension of commerce. The development of them has depended, at different periods, on the state of military and naval science, the weapons and tactics of the times, the habits and position of the soldier, the character of the wars which have successively agitated Europe, the distribution of power among nations. There have been partial customs which have never become general, as in the days of Philippe de Commines it was deemed lawful by the Spaniards and Italians, but not by the French, to hang persons who attempted to carry succour into a besieged town; and as the French Admiralty Courts long adhered to the maxim, rejected and

ultimately overruled by other maritime Powers, that neutral property under a hostile flag was good prize. They are enforced by retaliation, and many a fruitless attempt has been made to perpetuate them by treaties. Some of them are lightly disregarded; some have hardened into a solidity which entitles them to judicial notice in courts of law. They have overgrown and modified the old savage notion of war, and made it very nearly obsolete, but they have not quite destroyed it, and it still largely influences our habits of thought and modes of expression.

The conception of war as an absolute interruption of all relations between the belligerents, snapping all ties, annihilating all restraints, and leaving men free to wreak their rage upon each other, has been implicitly assumed and acted on during the greater part of the world's history. It is monstrous and unchristian, but it is broad, intelligible, and convenient. As long as it retains its sway, the milder usages by which it has been tempered in practice may be engrafted on it, but cannot be developed out of it. To depopulate a smiling country, to massacre or enslave prisoners, to perpetrate every kind of barbarity upon the conquered, is a legitimate way of carrying on hostilities; such things become the ordinary incidents and consequences of war, and it matters not whether they are done in the way of punishment or intimidation, or in the wanton indulgence of cruelty, rapacity, or caprice. I know nothing which conveys to the mind a livelier impression of this primary idea than those sculptured slabs from Egypt and Assyria, commemorating wars and conquests every other trace of which has passed away; where by all the rude resources of his art, including the relative size and workmanship of his figures, the stonecutter has laboured to produce a vigorous representation of the *væ victis*—of triumphant pride and abject humiliation. What a story is told by those miserable herds of captives, impaled on poles, tied in strings, or gathered, as it were, in bunches for slaughter, over whom, at the bidding of a king as tall as a steeple, an executioner three times their size brandishes stiffly a prodigious weapon! These groups, though descriptive of real events and full of minute accuracies of detail, may indeed have been symbolical more than literal—epics rather than histories in stone; but what they symbolize is war, as the artist understood, and his employers practised it. In Greece and Italy, where the character of the western intellect and the mutual intercourse of numerous small States early produced an inchoate and rudimentary system of public law, these terrible rights of conquest took their place within it unquestioned, and acquired a sort of

positive sanction and recognition. It is an eternal law, says Xenophon, speaking in the character of his hero, Cyrus, among all nations, that, when a city is taken, the persons and possessions of the inhabitants become the property of the conquerors. It was a law certainly of which his own Free Company availed themselves, whenever an opportunity offered, without scruple or restraint. Everybody remembers the massacres of Platæa and Melos, and the deliberate butcheries by which Cæsar crushed the last struggle for freedom on the moors of Brittany and the banks of the Rhine. The execution of Nicias and Demosthenes was no infraction of the received laws of war, and the vanquished potentates who figured in a Roman triumph resigned themselves to an expected fate when they left the long procession, the blaze of daylight, and shouting crowds, to enter the cell which they never quitted alive. War supplied regularly and legitimately the innumerable multitude of slaves which half peopled the ancient world. The slave-dealer hung about every Roman army on active service, and bought on the spot, for a comparative trifle, droves of human cattle, whom he sent to fetch their price at the great centres of wealth and trade. There they were bought in the market, ticketed with the names of the countries from which they came. The usage they received varied with the customs of the people amongst whom they found themselves, and the character of their masters and overseers; but nobody seems ever to have bestowed a thought on their previous condition of life, or to have treated them as persons who *had been* free. The 'human chattel,' the 'tool with a soul,' of Aristotle, is mere live stock with the Latin writers on farming. They sank to the level of their condition, and became debased, as a class, by the habits and humiliations of slavery. Mr. Grote has well observed how the intense interest which the non-military part of the population must have felt in every great struggle deepens the light and shade of the battle-pieces of Thucydides, and 'infuses into them an almost Homeric expression of personal emotion and suffering.' But there is something almost more impressive in the dry careless phrase, speaking the habitual feeling of society, in which these calamities are mentioned among the ordinary incidents of a campaign—the half-sentence which Xenophon gives to the number of head of men and other cattle yielded by the sack of a peaceful town, or Cæsar to the fate of a German corps intercepted after avoiding a capitulation. '*Cæteros in hostium numero habuit.*' 'He treated them as enemies.' A euphemism of the camp, which tells its own tale.

The mitigations which war, thus regarded, is capable of

receiving are, as I have said, not deducible from the fundamental notion of the thing itself, but of external growth. Mercy, the manly self-respect which spares a fallen foe, and the instinctive reverence for good faith, clothing themselves for most part in the venerable garb of religion, interpose and exert an influence which is at best, however, precarious and uncertain. The Platæans, in their extremity, pleaded a usage having almost the force of law, that the lives of those who surrendered voluntarily should be spared.—'Ἑκόντας ἐλάβετε καὶ χεῖρας προισχομένους, ὁ δὲ νόμος τοῖς Ἕλλησι μὴ κτείνειν τούτους.' But they pleaded in vain. The relation which the leading states held towards their allies, the class animosities which reigned within and amongst them, and their fierce jealousies, made more fierce by their small population and close neighbourhood, supplied motives and arguments for barbarities, against which their intellectual cultivation ought to have raised a perpetual protest. They drew their slaves, however, for the most part, from foreign countries, ransoming generally the captives of their own race whom they did not slay.

These remarks are liable to one qualification. At this early stage in the growth of the *jus belli*, the ceremonial part of it is more solemn and ample, perhaps, than at any other. The more profound and terrible the gulf which a declaration of hostilities opens, the more formal and deliberate should be the manner of opening it,—the more sacred those expedients should be held by which it is temporarily bridged over. Hence the Latin *fecial* with his reiterated demands for redress and appeals to Heaven, and his lance charred and dipped in blood, emblem of the coming scourge of sword and fire. Hence a *jus legatorum* fenced with observances, rigidly maintained at home and enforced abroad. Both Rome and Greece had tales to tell of citizens delivered up by way of atonement to barbarian enemies, whose ambassadors had been murdered or insulted; and the Greek, fanciful in his superstitions, traced the taint of sacrilege through two generations, believed that the generosity of the Persian monarch could not balk the anger of Heaven, and saw in the murder of two innocent men at Athens the final expiation of the crime for which their forefathers had voluntarily offered themselves to atone. Historians observe that in the later times of the Roman Republic some assumed violation of the ambassadorial privilege supplied more than once the pretext for inhumanities really intended to smooth the path of conquest. For Rome was never at a loss, when an opportunity presented itself, to make a stride or crush an enemy. Perpetually at war—perpetually advancing—torn by

frequent convulsions at home, but pursuing in her foreign policy one undeviating aim, with iron steadfastness of purpose —without magnanimity, without pity, without passion, she used to the utmost the rights of a belligerent as they were then understood, and was cruel and merciful by turns, as calculation or the sagacious instinct of conquest prompted. The sack of Syracuse and Agrigentum, the razing of Carthage, the brutal destruction of Corinth, were the work of generals who received honour and thanks from the Republic; yet Cæsar, fresh from the slaughter of the Eburones, could spare Massilia after it had twice broken through terms of capitulation. In his time, however, and afterwards, war was waged on a great scale, with large regular armies; and such wars, though attended with much wholesale carnage, are impressed with a certain character of order—are less ferocious, less calamitous to individuals, less oppressive to industry. In the great military establishments of the Empire, as in its civil administration, there were a method and subordination, never seen before; the 'Service' (like all services) would have its private military code, its rules and traditions; though, broken as it was into many great corps which were often arrayed against each other, scattered over a vast area, composed of rude and mixed materials, employed in keeping in check half-civilized provinces, and in border campaigns against barbarous tribes, those rules, as regarded the treatment of enemies, would necessarily be rough and flexible, and probably cruel. Its private code, I say—for there were no materials for a public one. Mistress of the world in aim and expectancy, long before it became hers in possession, Rome never admitted, at least as against herself, a law of nations, or any law but her own. The reciprocal forbearances, the mutual conventions and engagements, the wholesome fear of retaliation, the respect for principles adopted by general consent among powers formidable to each other, out of which the public law of modern Europe has grown up, had no place under her advancing shadow, still less beneath her imperial sway. Hence, in dealing with this subject, jurists have found little or no assistance in that great storehouse of wisdom, from which all civilized nations have derived the principles of their civil jurisprudence.

The influences, such as they were, which tempered the horrors of war in the later times of the empire, vanish amid the discordant clash of iron, the ceaseless din and turmoil of hostilities, regular and irregular, which rise out of the dim obscurity of the 'dark ages.' The successive surges which shook, broke up, and, finally, submerged the Empire, and afterwards dashed wildly over and against each other, subsided by

degrees; but the unutterable wickedness of those lawless times, during which men seemed created for nothing but to commit or suffer cruelty and oppression, stamped its impress of ferocity on the next age in characters of blood and fire. The rise of the feudal system gave each man an immediate superior; but a feudal army, unpaid, bound to serve only for a limited period, and animated through its higher ranks by a fiery impatience of control, was a machine which could not be brought into action without inflicting great suffering and devastation wherever it moved. Yet the feudal period, when chivalry was in the ascendant and war was the universal pastime of gentlemen expensively mounted and armed, was not, comparatively speaking, a barbarous one. Chivalry, aiding and aided by religion, taught mercy to the fallen—taught loyalty and truth,—and bequeathed to modern soldiership, as well as to civil society, somewhat of its gallant self-devotion, its stately yet simple courtesies, and its fine though fantastic sense of honour. The institution of knighthood made men of all countries—though not, unhappily, of all ranks—members of one great fraternity, bound, even when they met as enemies in the field, by rules and duties towards each other. The Christian Church, one throughout the world, interceded, enjoined, threatened, sometimes on the very battle-field itself, enforced its stated truces, spread its shield over the helpless, and condemned the enslavement of Christian men.* A habit of submission to public opinion, to military usage, and to established order, grew up even where we might least expect to find it, among the rude yet complicated regulations which made tolerable the practice of 'private war.' In the formal defiances which passed between enemies, in the capitulations of fortresses, the safe-conducts granted, the occasional

---

* The *direct* influence of Christianity in imposing lasting restraints on the licence of war does not appear to have been very considerable. And to say that its indirect effects have been less than they ought to have been, is only to repeat the confession which every Christian must make respecting himself and the society to which he belongs. Religion has not made the mass of men merciful, as she has not made them self-denying, truthful, or pure. Perhaps her power has been even less sensible here than elsewhere; for religion has never known exactly how to deal with war, and the difficulty has rather increased than diminished in our own times, when a kind of *mauvaise honte* seems to have grown upon her, making her confine herself to the interior life of men, to the church and closet, and indisposing her to follow them into the throng and bustle of the world, and claim, as she ought, her visible dominion over every lawful pursuit in which they may engage. St. Augustine certainly hoped for more when he wrote the first book of his great treatise.

appeals to arbitration, and the punctilious respect for heralds (which other ambassadors did not share), you may trace the existence of a military code, imperfect but well understood, and a mutual reliance on plighted faith. The captive, now the recognised property of his captor, had a pecuniary value: he was sold, given away, bargained for, squabbled for; he might be put to death, if not ransomed; but he had ceased to be a domestic slave, and he was often released on parole (which he scrupulously observed) to raise the means of repurchasing himself among his tenantry and friends. Often, however, and with increasing frequency as chivalry itself declined, the most sacred of conventional rules gave way before a tempting opportunity or a fit of ungovernable passion. The characteristic of the age, indeed, is that sharp and perpetual contrast between gentleness and ruthless violence, confidence and distrust, black treachery and knightly honour, which give it a strange picturesqueness, and have rendered it the favourite field for historical romance. But chivalry, as a 'cheap defence of nations,' broke down. It received its first wound at Morgarten; and the battle of Crecy, won by English archers, serving for hire, and the despised infantry of Ireland and Wales, destroyed it for ever in the estimation of Europe, though it lingered on to receive its final death-blow on the field of Agincourt. A new soldiery rapidly filled its place. Then appeared the 'Companies,' long the curse and scourge of France and her neighbours—the *Tard-venus*, too late for victory but not for pillage—Bretons, Gascons, English, who grew in numbers and in audacity, hunted like wolves one day, bought and caressed the next, whose great chief, Duguesclin, began by crushing them, and ended by raising them to the highest pitch of power and importance that they attained on this side of the Alps. Introduced into Italy and naturalized there, these irregular regulars soon showed the tendency which seems to belong to every military machine—to grow too costly and elaborate for use. Employed by wealthy and unwarlike states, and continually changing sides, the leaders of the Free Lances grew rich and powerful, founded sovereign houses, and had reduced the wars of the peninsula to bloodless games of skill and cunning, when down came in swarms the ruffianly German lansquenets and the greedy and ruthless Spanish foot, with a French militia habituated to carnage in the English and Burgundian wars, overran its rich plains, fought under different masters for the pillage of its cities, and crowned their iniquities by the sack of Rome. The civil contests which desolated almost every European country during the fifteenth century, the struggle for power between France and the Empire, and the religious quarrels of the six-

teenth and seventeenth, introduced in their turn new elements of violence and disorder, which found their freest and most calamitous scope in the Thirty Years' War. Then Grotius, full of grief and indignation at what he saw around him, sat down to compose the treatise which opened a new field of research in the debatable ground between law and ethics, became a text-book in aftertimes for princes, statesmen, and soldiers, and has acquired, by being cited and appealed to, a certain authority in the controversies of nations.

The principle substantially laid down by Grotius and his successors (and before him by the Dominican, Francesco Victoria) is, that the necessary steps to a lawful end being themselves lawful, the proper test to apply to any questionable act of violence is the inquiry whether it is in any reasonable sense necessary to the attainment of the object in view?* The ties which unite the members of the human family—the ties of universal brotherhood and of civil society,—are *not* totally dissolved by war; the obligations which make up a man's duty to his neighbour continue in force, except so far as they are incompatible with the effectual use of the only means whereby an aggrieved nation can obtain redress. Necessity, indeed, is a word which interprets itself very differently to different men at different times; and it may well happen, in particular cases, that the object of war is attainable only by means to which it would nevertheless be wrong to resort. In short, the rule, like other moral principles, is of little use unless it is conscientiously applied. It does not follow, however, that books and writers of books have exercised, in this matter, no beneficial influence. They have contributed powerfully to the diffusion of just and humane views amongst men of action, to the virtual abandonment of the old maxim, '*Jus belli infinitum*,' and the acceptance of doctrines which positively condemned, at least, all wanton barbarities. Meanwhile, the political system of Europe became consolidated; and succeeding wars, down to the era of the French Revolution, were the wars of statesmen and 'governments,' waged for political ends with large bodies of men, drilled, disciplined, and manœuvred according to formal rules. The spread of commerce, the progress of letters and science, and the growth of public opinion, all tended in the same direction.

* Grotius himself does not put it exactly in this way. He proposes two questions—What *is* lawful? What *ought* to be so? *Quid licitum? quid fas?* His treatment of the first is unsatisfactory, partly because the historical learning of his age was almost entirely classical, partly because the actual 'usages of war' in his time were much looser and ruder than now.

Hence, in this, as in other lines of historical inquiry, the Peace of Westphalia is one of those points at which the student stops to look about him, and, finding it a convenient halting-place, makes it a landmark of his journey.

The immediate object in war is to get the better of the enemy, which may be done by subduing his means of resistance, by the conquest of territory, by drying up his sources of national wealth, by inflicting on his people injury, suffering, or terror. Military operations, in modern times, are chiefly confined to the first two of these means of offence; the whole science of strategy consists in selecting some point of military or political importance, or several of such points in succession, and in directing upon these points a force greater than can be opposed to it. Modern warfare discards, therefore, as a general rule (on dry land, at least), devastation and pillage, and all injury to private property, as instruments for the accomplishment of its ends; and the gradual, though not uniform, tendency of it has been to exclude them altogether. Some notes of the progress made in this respect during the last five centuries, may afford a convenient general illustration of the subject of this Essay.

In the summer of 1346, an English army, under Edward III., landed on the coast of Normandy, amongst a peaceful and industrious people, who, says Froissart, had never heard a battle-cry, or seen an armed man. They took and sacked Barfleur and Cherbourg, and marched on St. Lo:—

'Si trouvérent le pais gras et plentureux de toutes choses, les granges pleines de blès, les maisons pleines de toutes richesses, riches bourgeois, chars, charrettes, et chevaux, pourceaux, brebis, moutons, et les plus beaux bœufs du monde que on nourrit dans ce pays.'*

Fair and cheerful province—delicious sight to a hungry invader, with its hamlets and church-towers, its substantial farms and large sleek cattle, thick orchards and green pastures, sweeping up-hill and down-dale to the winding margin of the sea! The English scattered themselves over it, 'ardant et exillant le pais,' and so advanced, burning and destroying—burning and destroying—over the rich flats of the Beauvoisin to the suburbs of Paris. Immense booty was taken; yet the English host, when it met the power of France at Crecy, was reduced to the utmost extremity of want.

Nearly seventy years had passed from this time, when Henry V. appeared before the gates of Harfleur. This time

* Froissart, II, 268.

no such scourge was to fall upon the Norman peasantry, who now knew too well the martial sounds so unfamiliar to their ears in the days of his great-grandfather. It was the policy of Henry, and was agreeable to his free and kindly disposition, to treat the French as subjects rather than as enemies. Great stores of bread, beef, and beer, provided at home, followed his army, and he allowed nothing to be exacted from the inhabitants, even when they resisted his passage, but bread and wine. Sir Harris Nicolas, in the Appendix to his *Battle of Agincourt*, has preserved the 'General Orders' issued on this occasion, which followed pretty closely those published in 1386 by Richard II. They prohibit strictly all bloodshed, insults to women, and wanton injury to property. The soldiers are to remain in their quarters, and to keep regular watch and ward, 'on payne of smytynge of his head that departeth.' Some extracts from them, and from the 'Orders' of the famous Talbot, Earl of Shrewsbury, may show how, and to what extent, an English general endeavoured to maintain discipline in the beginning of the fifteenth century.

'*A Statute for them that lette Labourers and men goinge to Plough.* (Shrewsbury.)

'That no man be so hardy to take fro no man going to the plough, harowe, or cart, hors, mare, nor oxe, nor non other beste longinge to labour within the kinge's obeysaunce, without louing and bedinge and grede the partye, upon payne of death, and that no man gave none impedyment to no man of labour.'

'*For Foreying the Country appatysed.**' (Shrewsbury.)

'Also that no man foraie in the country appatised, but if it be haye, ottes, rye, and other necessary vitailles, nor that no man geve unto his hors no wheate, nor to gader non, but if it be only to make brede of, and if the said foraiers take any bestaill for their sustenance that they take reasonably, and to make no waste, nor for to devour nor destroye no vitailles, and also that the saide foraiers take nor stell no great oxen ne no mylche keene, but small bestaill, and that they accorde with the p'tie upon the payne aforesaide.'

'*For them that destroyeth Vines and other Tres beringe frute.* (Shrewsbury.)

'Also that no maner of man bete downe howsing to borne, ne non apletres, peretres, nottres, ne no other tres bering frute, nor that no man put no best into vynes, nor drawe up the stakes of same vynes.'

---

* 'Appatyser — contraindre les habitans d'un pays a nourrir les troupes.' (Roquefort) [Nicolas.]

'*For Women that lie in Gesem.** (HENRY.)

'Also that no manner of man be so hardy to goe into no chamber or lodging wher that any woman lieth in gesem, her to robbe ne pille of no goodes the whiche longeth to her refressheing, ne for to make non affray wher through she and her childe myght be in any disease or dispere, upon payn that he that in suche wise offendeth shall losse all his goodes, half unto him that acuseth him and half unto the Counstable and Marshall, and himself to be dede but if the king give him his grace.'

'*A Statute for Children within the age of xiiij yeres.* (HENRY.)

'Also that no man be so hardey to take no childerne within the age of xiiij yere, but if he be a lorde's sonne, or els a worshipfull gentelman's sonne, or a capitayne, and that as sone as he hath brought him into the oste, or in to the gernyson where his is abyding, that he brynge him to the lorde, master, or capitayn, upon payn of losing hors, harneys, and his part of the same childe, res'ving unto his lorde, master, or capitayn his duety, so that they be not consentant unto the default, also that the said lorde, master, or capitayn bring him unto the King or counstable within viij days upon.'

'*For Wemen that usen Bordel the whiche longe in the Oste.* (SHREWSBURY.)

'Also that no maner of man have ne holde no comon woman within his lodging, upon peyne of losing a monthes wages, and if any man fynde any comon woman lodginge my saide lorde geveth him leve to take from her all the mony that may be founde upon her, and take a stafe and dryve her out of the oste and breke her arme.'

The ordinances of Henry were strictly enforced. The hanging of Bardolph for stealing a pix was a real incident of this campaign, and it occurred when the army was in its greatest straits, before the Battle of Agincourt.

Here we have the elements of a most important change, the substitution of a system of requisitions for indiscriminate pillage. Froissart's heroes, who 'chevauchent en avant, ardant et exillant,' through all the pages of his Chronicle, and all the fertile provinces which were the scene of their exploits, seldom troubled themselves to distinguish between devastation as a means of injuring the enemy, and as a source of subsistence for their followers. For both purposes, or for either, it was part of the legitimate licence of war. But as discipline increased, and the irregular incursions of early times—beginning with a foray, and ending in a battle,—developed into long and complicated operations carried on over a limited area through successive campaigns, experience

* Gesem—childbirth.

taught that it was both possible and necessary to husband the resources of the country which was the seat of war, to put down marauding, and afford general protection to agriculture. Calculating foresight enforced the dictates of humanity, and to provide for the subsistence of armies in the field became an important branch of the science of generalship. This change, however, is hardly perceptible in the wars of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, of which an insatiable greediness for plunder forms perhaps the most characteristic feature. Not many years after the death of Henry V., a great part of France was again a desert, and famished wolves seized their prey in the streets of Paris. The French invasions of Italy were undertaken without magazines or money; the country was fertile and populous, and the invaders lived on its resources; and though Louis XII. aimed at the character of a rigid disciplinarian and a punctual paymaster, his efforts seem to have availed little, and his example less. Plunder and the ransom of prisoners were ordinary means of acquiring a competence; to raise a handful of men and join any expedition that might happen to be afoot, was the readiest way of bettering yourself; and every lad of spirit, who had no taste for learning or no interest in the Church, was expected to make his fortune in the profession of arms. The native soldiers of France were, like those of England, hastily raised and hastily disbanded; but during the civil wars great numbers of them were always on foot, though Swiss and German mercenaries constituted the chief strength of the Royal armies. There is an anecdote in Sully's *Memoirs* which, if true, curiously illustrates the habits of his day. Villefranche and Montpazier, two small towns in Perigord, were surprised and pillaged both in the same night. When day broke, it turned out that the captors of Villefranche were the people of Montpazier, and those of Montpazier the citizens of Villefranche. Upon making this notable discovery, both parties entered into an amicable arrangement, restored the booty they had taken, and returned to their respective homes. Sully himself, it appears, had no objection to be reminded of the windfalls which fell to his share on these occasions; and the exactness with which they are noted down by his secretaries shows that they were remembered with sober complacency by that respectable statesman. The Prince of Parma's march to Paris in 1590 was a solitary instance of a general supporting his army entirely by his own resources, in order to conciliate the people amongst whom he came. The fierce severity with which Wallenstein ruled his heterogeneous hosts could not curb the rapacity of his officers, or restrain in his own ranks excesses which were perpetrated with impunity by the soldiery of Tilly and

Mansfeldt. Gustavus Adolphus was more successful in this respect,* but four years had not passed since his death, when the Swedish troops of Banner, bursting into Saxony and Bohemia, after the victory of Witstoch, made those countries 'a sea of fire,' and earned for themselves an imperishable record among the terrible traditions of the Thirty Years' War. Nor were the French under Guebriant, though differently composed, a whit better conducted. The soldiers of that time (the Swedes under Gustavus excepted) were never regularly paid; living by requisitions, and making food and winter quarters the object of their campaigns, they exhausted, like swarms of locusts, one district after another. The supplies raised were not systematically husbanded or properly distributed. Moreover, they were insufficiently and badly officered. In the iron-handed and iron-hearted Spaniard—the model infantry-man of his day,—the roving Walloon, and the English soldier of fortune, trained in Flanders and Germany, you have types of the soldier, such as hard service, stern discipline, and *esprit de corps* would make him. But there was wanting, in the mercenary swarms of homeless men who swept to and fro over Europe, that high professional sense of honour and duty—that unbroken chain of subordination descending from the general to the private, without which the former can no more keep in hand the machine he has to govern than a coachman who does not 'feel the mouths' of his team. In the *Wellington Dispatches* you see how thoroughly, to a modern general, his officers are his army. The Duke never omits an opportunity of making them sensible of his own dependence upon them, and his severest reproofs are addressed to feelings to which it would have been vain to appeal in the camps of Pilsen and Prague.

In all these respects there is a vast improvement when we find ourselves among the formal evolutions and in the dignified and gracious presence of the Duke of Marlborough. That great captain, during the best part of his career,

---

* Mr. Trench has observed, however, after Fuller, that our language owes the word *plunder* to the men who returned from the Swedish service to take part in the wars of the Commonwealth. (*Study of Words*, p. 124). The Scot who went

> 'To mak his fortune in the high Germanie,
> To fight the foreign loons in their ain countrie,'

and the wandering Englishman who, like Defoe's 'Cavalier,' took service with the Swede, saw war in all its horrors, though they learnt it in the best and strictest school extant. In our civil wars, Prince Rupert's 'German way of plundering,' as it was then called, was practised on both sides; but Mr. Warburton has well shown how unlike it was to the true 'German way.'

was employed with his French antagonists in manœuvring large bodies of regular troops upon a small field, which fell by turns into the hands of each of the contending parties; and they have left us an example of the degree to which—even where the gross pressure is necessarily severe, —prudent forbearance and strict discipline may mitigate the horrors of war. According to a standing arrangement, each belligerent levied upon the country in his occupation requisitions proportioned to its means, which he enforced, if necessary, by threats of military execution. If a *mandement* exceeded what, in the opinion of the local authorities, the district could supply, they sent a complaint to the head-quarters of the friendly army, which was attended to immediately. Strong but civil remonstrances followed, with threats of reprisals, and tart but still civil replies;—for those were days of elaborate politeness, even among foes. When a general, who had occasion to write to his adversary, used to implore him 'to be persuaded that I shall always seek for opportunities of testifying to you the real respect and esteem with which I am, &c. &c.,' there was little to be feared from an abuse of language.* Here is a specimen of Marlborough's sharpest, and very good writing it is.

'*Marlborough to the Duke of Berwick.*

24th July, 1708.

'J'ai eu l'honneur, Monsieur, de recevoir votre lettre, et vous dirai pour réponse que rien n'est plus usitée que les demandes que j'ai faites pour la service de mon armée. Tout ce qu'on peut prétendre dans un pays soumis à contributions c'est qu'on tienne compte de vos demandes sur les contributions, et c'est ce que je veux bien faire pour vous marquer que je n'aime point a faire les violences mais que je ne veux me servir que du droit de la guerre reçu et pratiqué en tout temps. Après cela, nous ne devons pas nous faire des défis à qui pourrait faire le plus de mal.

'Je suis très parfaitement, Monsieur,' &c.†

These contributions were settled through commissioners sent for the purpose to the hostile camp. 'I have just now,' writes Marlborough, 'a trumpet from Monsieur Bernage, Intendant of Picardy, to desire passes for commissioners to treat of the contributions for that part of the province which lies on this side the Somme.' The exaction of wood or forage from an assessed district was strictly forbidden, as contrary to

* Compare the epistolary style of that terse and rapid letter-writer, Prince Rupert—'In the interim, I am your friend till I meet you next. Rupert.'—(Warburton's *Prince Rupert and the Cavaliers*, i. 401.)

† *Despatches*, iv. 128.

the *Traité*, and all extra supplies which such a district was compelled to furnish were scrupulously paid for—so scrupulously, that one day two deputies arrive from the Chatellenerie of Furnes, complaining that the people of that place have been paid for the corn exacted from them according to the market-price at Amsterdam, and not by the price-current in Flanders, and they obtain redress on the spot.

Just, as well as humane, careful of the comfort of his soldiers, capable (like most great generals) of minute attention to details, correct in his own habits, and spreading an air of decency around him, Marlborough did much to civilize the profession he adorned. Eye-witnesses describe his camp as resembling a quiet, well-governed city. 'His soldiers, after one or two campaigns, became tractable, civil, sensible, and clean, with an air and spirit above the vulgar.' From his wars, we may suppose, returned many a Corporal Trim. He seems, on the whole, to have been well served, and never before had war worn so decorous an aspect, or mixed so closely and familiarly with peace. Campaigning had become a science under the auspices of Gustavus and Turenne; and Villars, a very different man from Marlborough, had been trained in the same school as he. Villars prided himself on being a strict disciplinarian, 'because nothing but order can enable you to find subsistence in an enemy's country, at a distance from your magazines.' His address to his troops on entering Germany in 1707, is like the Duke of Wellington's orders on crossing the Pyrenees—with this difference, however, that the Duke paid his army with English money, while Villars defrayed his expenses by heavy pecuniary contributions exacted from the neighbouring States, a large portion of which he put in his own pocket.

'Mes amis, leur dis-je, ... si vous brûlez, si vous faites fuire les peuples, vous mourrez de faim. Je vous ordonne donc, pour votre propre intérêt et pour celui du Roi, d'être sages.'

Again he writes in 1713,—

'J'eus la satisfaction de faire subsister pendant trois mois, 200 bataillons et plus de 300 escadrons dans la longueur de 20 lieues de pais sur 5 de large, entre les montagnes et le Rhin, sans qu'aucun paysan quittât son habitation. Cela n'avoit sans doute été possible que par la plus sévère discipline et la plus parfaite économie, parties de la guerre auxquelles je m'étois singulièrement appliqué. . . . Les peuples de ce pays, qui jusque là n'avoient vu nos soldats que le flambeau à la main, surpris qu'on ne fit aucun dégât chez eux, venoient d'eux-mêmes nous apporter nos besoins.'*

* *Mémoires* (Petitot), ii. 410.

Villars was a Frenchman, and there is something characteristic in his garrulous self-satisfaction at the neatness and success of an operation which consisted in extracting from a district, without cruelty and without waste, the very utmost that its resources would afford. It would have been well if his moderation, such as it was, had been universal with his countrymen, and if the excesses from which generals had learnt to refrain in countries occupied by themselves had been altogether banished from the practice of war. But Germany and Savoy tell another tale. Turenne himself had set the example of laying waste large tracts in order to deprive an adversary of the means of subsistence; and the crimes perpetrated by the troops of Catinat and Feuquieres were licensed by instructions from Paris. The devastations of the Palatinate, to which Villars refers in the passage quoted above, were ordered and executed in cold blood, and will never be forgotten as long as any tradition remains of the venerable splendour of those old imperial cities which no traveller now turns aside to visit, and while the Palace of Heidelberg, a picture of sumptuous beauty in decay, exists among the historical monuments of Europe. The huge Romanesque churches of red sandstone rising out of the flats of the Upper Rhine, which mark to the passer-by on rail or river the situation of Worms and Spire, are found, on a nearer approach, surrounded by the sites of ruined cities, partially overgrown with mean houses; and those cathedrals themselves owe their preservation only to the massive solidity of construction which defied the efforts of the French engineers. Belleisle's directions, in 1759, to 'make a desert of Westphalia,' were too faithfully obeyed; and down to the time of the Revolution a 'Pavillon d'Hanovre' in the gardens of the Duc de Richelieu represented to the eyes of the Parisians the spoils brought home from the Seven Years' War. It is to be observed, however, that special military reasons, though bad ones, were assigned for these atrocities, that they were protested against and condemned. The Prussians and Austrians, in Frederick's time, contented themselves with levying contributions wherever they moved; and, speaking generally, the habit of depending for subsistence on magazines and on the cumbrous provision-trains which followed armies on the march, is noted by Jomini as a characteristic of the wars of the eighteenth century.

In the course of the first American War, according to Martens, the British government laid down certain propositions as admitted principles. An army, they said, in occupation of an enemy's country, may demand provisions and raise contributions, enforcing its demands, if necessary, by military execution—that is, by fire and sword. It is lawful to ravage

an invaded country when you have no other means of bringing the enemy to reason, or, should he pertinaciously avoid an engagement, of compelling him to fight. And where, as in the case of a rebellion, the inhabitants are themselves principal parties to the war, they are liable, of course, to be treated as enemies. These propositions represent the understanding which then existed on the subject with as much accuracy as could be expected from an invading power claiming rights of sovereignty over the invaded territory. Three centuries before they would have been repudiated as fettering a right which practically knew no limitation. They look rather broad now. The right to ravage has not, as far as I am aware, since asserted itself, except in the plea of necessity which French jurists advance for the razzias of their troops in Algeria, and in the narrow exception claimed for other possible cases of necessity,—where, for instance, it is absolutely required to stop the progress of an enemy, to protect a frontier, or open the approaches to a fortress; cases the same in kind as those in which inevitable damage is done to private property by the evolutions of armies in the field. The latest instance, I believe, in which it has been exercised on any considerable scale was the burning of Newark by the Americans in 1813, ordered* (ostensibly at least) for the purpose of clearing the Canadian boundary against the winter, and the measures of retaliation which followed it. The firing of a few deserted farms and rickyards inconveniently near to the fortified posts at Kinburn and Eupatoria is the utmost that has been done in this way in the present war.†

---

* The act was disavowed at Washington, and American historians say the order was misconceived.

† It has been suggested lately that we have gone too far in this direction, and that it would be better, from motives of pure humanity, to return to the good old way of ravaging and burning, at least where we can do it—as our fleets can on the Baltic coast—without fear of retaliation. Louvois was a humanitarian of this school. When he ordered the Palatinate to be laid waste, in order to force the Elector to submit, there was no danger lest that unhappy prince should inflict the same miseries on France. It is questionable, however, as a matter of ordinary probability, whether ravaging and burning, especially since they have ceased to be usual operations of war, are likely means of bringing an enemy into a peaceable frame of mind, whilst it is certain that they would produce rooted national hatreds and resentments such as are happily unknown in our times. And as a matter of fact, no one will say that war has become more frequent and obstinate in proportion as it has grown milder. The reverse is the case. Independently of all this, it is obvious enough that the principle of not making war on non-combatants, which has been gradually established by the general consent of civilized nations, but on which we are now urged to break in—for, of course, it ceases to be a principle at all, if it is to be disregarded

The system of requisitions remained, and in the wars which followed the French Revolution was used, as every one knows, with oppressive severity, and on a gigantic scale. It extended gradually all over Europe, as all Europe was covered by French troops, and reached its climax in the incredible extortions by which Prussia and her allies were wrung and crushed after the campaign of Jena. Many a man now living remembers how French regiments were marched, lean and threadbare, into a subject province, to march out again, in a few weeks, plump and warmly clothed from top to toe. Employed, not as a subsidiary resource, to supply those troops with immediate necessaries, but as their primary and sole means of support, it enabled Napoleon to move armies over a continent like pieces on a chessboard, and effect those grand and rapid combinations which astonished the world; whilst to the officers, high and low, it presented irresistible, and certainly unresisted, temptations to robbery and plunder. 'You take kingdoms,' said a trooper, accused of marauding, to Charles XII.; 'why am I to be hung for making free with a cabbage?' The question was a solecism in discipline; but such thoughts will sometimes pass through the soldier's mind, and the rough, illiterate men to whom, after every conquest, their master threw dukedoms, principalities, and crowns, naturally deemed it no harm to help themselves (as he did) whenever an opportunity offered, to money, plate, and works of art. To this vast extension of the system the Duke of Wellington probably refers when he says, rather broadly (in a passage which Alison seems to have followed), that the system itself dates from the Revolution. 'It is a system,' says the Duke, in his downright way, 'which must be got the better of;' and get the better of it he did, as far as the thing could be done by beating thoroughly, in a long game, the armies which used, and giving the finishing stroke to the power founded on it, whilst rigidly refraining from it himself. That the peculiar discipline and vigorous administration of the French armies were here very serviceable to them, he admits; for Napoleon's boast—'Our presence is not felt'—when, at the head of a great force, and far from his own frontier, he was not drawing a *sou* from home, was not *quite* so empty as at first sight it looks. 'The starvation of the Spaniards,' said the

---

as often as an opportunity offers of distressing or terrifying an enemy with impunity to yourself—is of immeasurably greater value, as a general restraint on ferocity and licence, than any problematical advantages which might possibly in some particular cases arise from the abandonment of it. True, it is a conventional principle, and it is *possible* to push it too far.

Duke, 'is more burdensome to the country than the plentiful living of the French.* But the system is one which must be worked out, in all its details, by force and terror,—'there is the use of the bayonet in every part of it.' For such a system, said his clear, practical sense, the British soldier is not fit; and even for the French themselves it must prove, and had proved, dangerous and bad in the long run.

His own Peninsular campaigns were carried on in a friendly country, which he was bound, as a matter of course, to spare, with the sea (brought nearer by a line of water-carriage) in his rear; and each time that he entered France, it was with friendly professions, and under the white flag.† But it seems to have been his clear opinion that the practice of living by requisitions is, under all circumstances, unsafe and inexpedient,—that it is *always* better to pay your way.‡ Nor

---

* There is a remarkable illustration of the sufferings which the French Republican armies (which had not acquired this organization) inflicted and underwent, in Soult's *Memoirs*, i. 324.

† The Duke of Brunswick, in 1792, paid for his supplies, but paid for them in waste paper. '*Bons* had been printed,' writes Goethe, who accompanied the army, 'which the commander signed, but whoever had them in his possession filled them up at his pleasure, according to circumstances, and Louis XVI. was to pay. I was myself present at a scene which I remember as a most tragic one. Several shepherds, who had succeeded in uniting their flocks, in order to conceal them for safety in the forests and other retired places, being seized by some active patrols and brought to the army, were at first well received and kindly treated. They were asked who were the different proprietors; the flocks were separated and counted. Anxiety and fear, but still with some hope, fluctuated in the countenances of the worthy people. But when this mode of proceeding ended in the division of the flocks among the regiments and companies, whilst on the other hand the pieces of paper drawn on Louis XVI. were handed over quite civilly to their proprietors, and their woolly favourites slaughtered at their feet by the impatient and hungry soldiers, I confess that my eyes and my soul have seldom witnessed a more cruel spectacle and more profound manly suffering in all its gradations.'—*Goethe's Campaign in France*, quoted in Lewes's *Life and Works of Goethe*, ii. 169.

‡ 'If,' said Wellington, at St. Jean de Luz, 'I could now bring forward 20,000 good Spaniards, paid and fed, I should have Bayonne. If I could bring forward 40,000, I do not know where I should stop. Now, I have both the 20,000 and 40,000 at my command on this frontier, but I cannot venture to bring forward any for want of means of paying and supporting them. Without pay and food they must plunder; and if they plunder, they will ruin us all.' I have referred in a preceding page to some General Orders of the fifteenth century. It is worth while to compare them with the Duke's on entering France (Gurwood, xi. 168), and the means he adopted to enforce order in his army. On the 9th July, 1813, the Duke was 'particularly desirous that the inhabitants should be well treated, and private property must be respected, as it has been hitherto.' On the 8th October, the day after the frontier was crossed,

was this the Duke's opinion only. The British flying squadron which harassed the American seaboard during the war of 1812, seizing or destroying all the public property within reach, purchased all the while the provisions of which it stood in need; and annalists relate how Admiral Cockburn paid out of his own pocket for a flock of turkeys on which a razzia had been made by some person or persons unknown. The Americans themselves claim the credit of having conscientiously adhered to the same principle in the Mexican war. Still, the right to levy contributions for subsistence and necessary services has not been expunged from the law of nations. It survives in the works of jurists; it would be exercised without scruple by any general wherever the inhabitants abandoned their homes or refused him a market; and it reappeared bodily (without any such necessity) in the Danish war of 1848. Here is a copy of the daily bill of fare of the Prussian army in Jutland, numbering 18,000 men:—

Beef, 20,700 lbs.
Rice, 5200 lbs.
Salt, 1400 lbs.
Bacon, 5200 lbs. (or 2650 lbs. of butter.)
Bread (common), 40,000 lbs.
Do. (white), 1400 lbs.
Sugar, 100 lbs.
Wine, 350 bottles.
Brandy, 5100 bottles.
Cigars (fine), 3300.
Do. (common), 100,000.
Hay, 16,500 lbs.
Straw, 19,800 lbs.
Oats, 325 barrels.

From which it appears that the Prussian soldier requires for

'outrages of all descriptions had been committed by the troops, in presence even of their officers, who took no pains whatever to prevent them.' The Duke republished his Orders of July, adding an intimation that officers so grossly negligent of their duty 'shall be sent to England, that their names may be brought under the notice of the Prince Regent, and that his Royal Highness may give such directions respecting them as he may think proper,—as the Commander of the Forces is determined not to command officers who will not obey his orders.' This appears to have been perfectly successful; and after ridding himself of the Spaniards, whom he had no means of supporting, and therefore could not keep in order, the Duke could write to Lord Bathurst that a new spirit had appeared among the officers, that the conduct of the British and Portuguese troops had been exactly what he wished, that the inhabitants 'are living very comfortably and quietly with our soldiers cantoned in their houses; and we really draw more supply from the country than we ever did from any part of Spain.'

his private smoking, besides the weed in its grosser form, six cigars a day. These exactions, however, were universally reprobated, and nothing of the kind has yet been attempted in the present war. The English and French troops who marched clattering, in the grey of the morning, through quiet hamlets to the attack of Bomarsund, resisted the temptations of the pigsty and poultry-yard, and bargained for their potatoes, within cannonshot of the fortress, with the peasant-girl who represented the proprietors of the soil. The Tartar villages, perched among the highlands of the Crimea, have been respected alike (whilst their owners remained in them) by British and French, Piedmontese and Turks; nothing has been extorted without payment,* and small thefts have been severely punished. Omar Pasha is said to have pursued the same course in Mingrelia. This has been the rule: the only exceptions, so far as I know, have been the excesses perpetrated at Kertch and Yenikale, and such irregularities and petty acts of licence as will inevitably occur in the wake or on the skirts of a great army.

On the whole, our review of this branch of the law of war shows that it has made progress from age to age,—is now in a transition state,—and tends towards the complete adoption of the principle proclaimed (but not acted on) by the Revolutionary Government of France,—that the peasant is no man's enemy, and that private property should be respected on a hostile as on a friendly soil.

As rapine and cruelty for the most part go hand in hand, so the same motives of convenience and humanity which proscribe the one have tended to mitigate the other. Of course, this is not invariably so. Each age, each country, has its own peculiar temper; individual character here comes more prominently into play, and a blacker shade has been cast over certain contests by intense hatreds of race, class, or religion. The cruelties, as we now consider them, of very early times, are natural incidents of a society in which life is cheap, because it is insecure,—a society violent in its enmities, brutal in its legislation, and fierce even in its pleasures. No established principle, no recognised moral obligation, is then

---

* The French, however, fix their own tariff; we pay the prices asked. The rule against pillage in the French army is, I believe, as strict as in our own, but there seems to be more licence allowed in practice. The Frenchman throws himself too thoroughly into the drama of war and the business and excitements of campaigning to be very scrupulous in them; and his ideal of a soldier differs, according to his national character and military traditions, somewhat from ours.

violated by refusing quarter to a vanquished enemy, or by murdering in cold blood captives whom it is dangerous or unprofitable to keep; and the slaughter of peasants on whose blood, even in peace, the law set a trifling value, could be no great crime in war. Mercy pleaded only for women, children, and *genz de l'Eglise*,—or, more falteringly, for the *poures genz*,—when there was no separation between the citizen and the soldier, and every able-bodied layman was therefore deemed an enemy. But the student finds, unhappily, little improvement as he proceeds. A profound horror and indignation seize the mind as one reads of the innumerable massacres, the towns sacked and burnt, the tortures and outrages inflicted on helpless men, women, and children, which cover those dark pages that record the two French invasions of Italy. No wonder that the Italians, accustomed among themselves to constant fighting and intrigue, were terrified into submission by atrocities which froze their blood. When Henry II. of France (whose pride it was, we are told, to leave nothing behind him, wherever he moved, but 'feu, flammes, fumée, et toute calamité,') entered the Low Countries, every city which did not surrender before he opened fire was given up to destruction, the garrison hung, the inhabitants put to the sword. The able generals who served the Emperor Charles V. were men insensible to pity, and we seem to wade in blood through the wars of Alva in Flanders, of the League, and of the two religions in Germany. Yet it must be observed that these things always float on the surface of history, which keeps the most faithful record of the greatest crimes, and that we find them condemned more and more decidedly as time goes on. And occasional episodes of high-minded courtesy, with the glimpses which we get of good and brave men who served and died in those licentious armies, suggest that the atmosphere which surrounded them, tainted as it was, was not so foul as to be absolutely fatal to the gentler virtues of Christian soldiership. Were there not—we may be sure there were—many originals of the Knight of *The Canterbury Tales*,—that thoroughly English portrait, whose robust, gravely cheerful features remind one of some of the faces—a little harder and more thoughtful—which look out from pictures of the old German and Flemish schools? The story of Bayard and his gentle hostess, into whose house he was carried wounded, and the young ladies who played and sang to him during his recovery, who brought him, at parting, their little gifts of dainty needlework (hair bracelets and a crimson satin purse, alike useless to a man who never had any money), and into whose aprons he poured, 'whether they would or no,' the box-full of

gold tremblingly offered him as the ransom of father, mother, daughters, house, and furniture—all his own property, according to the existing laws of war,—this story, one of the prettiest in the world, is found in the midst of the horrors of the sack of Brescia, the wild licence of which ruined irretrievably the discipline of the French army. And the biographer (Bayard's secretary, it seems), who tells it with such pleasant simplicity, has nothing but a coarse jest to spare for brave men hung from the walls of a castle which they had attempted to defend. A few ragamuffins, he calls them, who were made to try the strength of their necks against the battlements. 'Y eut quelques rustres dedans pris, lesquels essayerent si leur col pourroit par force emporter ung creneau.'

It had become an established rule, before the end of the sixteenth century, that non-resisting persons should be spared, —though the writer who mentions it adds, that he never heard it extended to the case of the garrison of a fortified place surrendering at discretion.* And the rule itself was lightly, sometimes habitually, regarded. Gustavus Adolphus found it necessary to enter into a regular convention with the Imperialists, binding both parties to give quarter,—the Duke of Pomerania's men, however, being excepted on the one side, and the Croats (by way of retaliation) on the other.† Gustavus himself, though a hot-tempered man, was uniformly humane, and the admiration which his brilliant career excited, not only amongst the Dalgettys of his army, but throughout Europe,

---

* Does this exception now survive? The Marquis of Santa Cruz, whose *Reflexions Militaires* were a great authority in the last century (he died in 1732), advises that no quarter should be given to the garrison of a town actually stormed, except to the superior officers. The Duc de Crillon threatened it at the siege of Gibraltar, and Lord Albemarle at the Havannah in 1762; and the same threat was repeatedly and successfully used by French generals to Spanish garrisons in the Peninsular War,—a French ordinance (which neither our own government nor our general thought fit to retaliate) having directed that it should be not only made, but *executed* in all cases where a place was taken by assault. Regularly, however, such a summons could only be delivered after the opening of a practicable breach. The menace, addressed to good troops, is invariably useless, and has seldom, I believe, been carried into execution in modern times. The heat and fury of the soldier at such a moment, and the instinct of self-preservation, will often prevent him from giving quarter till he is completely master of the place; but an *order* to give none, even after a summons refused, would now be deemed barbarity, and the *deliberate* slaughter of a garrison, as at Jaffa, would certainly be protested against as not justified by the actual usages of war.

† So, quarter was refused to the Irish who came over to take part in our civil wars; and when Prince Rupert retaliated, the Parliament desired he should be told that there was a great difference between an Englishman and an Irishman.

added weight to his example. Downright barbarity to non-combatants and unresisting persons has certainly become more rare in practice during the last two hundred years; and neither the bad celebrity of men like Feuquieres and Melac, willing tools of a relentless minister, nor the massacres of Lugo and Jaffa, need prevent us from saying that gentler manners, milder laws, and an improved tone of professional feeling, have here exercised a direct and beneficial influence. Soldiers have shown themselves, on more than one occasion, less hard-hearted than statesmen. The sanguinary decrees of the Convention, which directed that no quarter should be given to English or Hanoverians, and that neutral sailors found on board of British ships should be put to the sword, were execrated and disobeyed. The miseries of captivity have been alleviated by the introduction of a regular system of exchange,* and by the understanding that the captors are bound, until an opportunity for the release of their prisoners arrives, to supply them with necessary comforts at the expense of the State to which they belong.

The elaborately scientific character of modern sieges, the use of artillery and musketry, which renders fighting a less butcherly business than of yore, when 'the clanging and carving of naked and unsheathed swords, the pushing of trailing pikes crying for blood,' made up the whole of a battle, have contributed to the same result, though the invention of explosive projectiles threatened, at first, to operate the other way. Louis XIV. set the example of bombarding cities; and when Dieppe, Havre, and Dunkirk received the same treatment from an English fleet, a medal is said to have been struck in England representing the bull of Phalaris, with the motto, '*Suis perit ignibus auctor.*' Frederick the Great destroyed in this way some of the finest buildings of Dresden and Prague, whilst loudly complaining of the Russians, who did the same thing at Custrin. The practice, however, whenever it was resorted to, was met by protests and complaints. The Duke of Wellington (who had been present at Copenhagen in 1807) never, in the whole course of his career, bombarded a besieged town, holding, that whilst it cruelly injured the inhabitants, it did little harm to the garrison. As a general rule, this is so. To destroy a place is the worst of all ways of taking it; and

---

* Exchanges were common, but not regularly established, in the Thirty Years' War, and seem to have been pretty systematically practised in the wars of the English Commonwealth. Cartels, fixing a uniform rate of ransom for prisoners not exchanged, were, I think, of somewhat later date.

though there are cases in which blood, as well as time, may be saved by this method of attack, I believe that a humane and experienced officer will very seldom indeed employ it against any part of a besieged town not actually occupied by troops, or serving some military purpose, offensive or defensive. The random use of projectiles at the siege of Friedrichstadt, in 1850, gave rise to much observation at the time. Religion and art, and the absence of any urgent motive for despatch, had protected Rome. To destroy, *for the sake* of destroying, as Louis XIV. more than once did, without any strategic object, can never be anything but wanton barbarity; the Archduke Albert was justly condemned when, on his retreat from France, in 1792, he amused himself, for seven days and nights, with throwing shells into Lille without having ordnance heavy enough to injure the casemates,—that is, without any reasonable prospect of taking it. A mere fortress, of course, may be as legitimately assailed by a vertical as by a horizontal fire. There the garrison are the inhabitants, as in an unfortified place which refuses to surrender the inhabitants are the garrison; and the most effectual way of mastering resistance is the best. In the present war, at least towards the end of the siege, Sebastopol was rightly treated (like Gibraltar and St. Jean d'Acre), as a mere fortress;* but the allied fleets, when they burnt the magazines of Sweaborg, spared Helsingfors, as Admirals Dundas and Hamelin had avoided injuring the commercial port and town of Odessa.

We have seen in the foregoing pages how slowly a military usage arises, how irregularly it grows, and how various are the causes by which, at different stages, it may be checked or thrown back. And we cannot have failed to notice that, of the many agents in the production of these laws, the most potent has been the gradual formation of regular armies. The advantages which flow from the substitution of regular for irregular hostilities are so obvious, and have been so well stated by Dr. Arnold, that it would be idle to dwell on them here; enough to say that it is the basis and necessary condition of the establishment in this wild region, which civil society abandons to licence, violence, and blood, of any conventional *system* whatever. These rules and customs are an unwritten code, the observance of which is rendered possible by discipline and enforced by professional feeling. The mutual convenience of soldiers, and their mutual respect, introduce

---

* Lord Raglan was requested, I believe, to spare a part of the town, alleged to be inhabited by women and children. He refused, but offered them a passage through his lines.

courtesies and forbearances which become gradually settled and defined, and take their place among things which every officer is bound to know and practice. Any violation of them is noticed at once, and the complaints thus occasioned (which are constantly occurring in all wars—we have had several in the present) form a body of unrecorded precedents, confirming and elucidating the principles appealed to. Thus, the siege of Breslau, in 1766, was commenced with pen and ink—Laudohn insisting that it was contrary to the laws of war to defend an open town, and threatening to bombard if the besieged would not surrender; Tauenzein contending that such a mode of attack was unjustifiable, and that the place was regularly fortified. Both parties were agreed about the usage, and the question was, whether a wall and wet-ditch constituted a fortification or no. The use of weapons artifically contrived to make painful or incurable wounds was an early subject of complaint. Capel and Lucas wrote formally to Fairfax about the 'chawd (chewed) bullets' found in the bodies of their men. In Marlborough's time it was usual to grant a great many passports; the abuse of this practice and the measure of respect due to it were then, as the treatment of prisoners has often since been, a fertile topic of remonstrance and recrimination. When General Rey, at San Sebastian, placed his captives in the yard of a magazine and made them work under fire, he was immediately served with a protest by the enemy who was battering the place about his ears. The Duke of Cumberland complained to Marshal Saxe, in 1745, of contumelies not half so bad as those inflicted on the survivors of the Hango massacre. When a Russian officer at Inkermann is taken in the act of stabbing disabled men, the first thing that follows is an interchange of messages; his captors offer to transmit 'the depositions' to the Russian head-quarters, and assert their right to punish him as a felon. Custom has settled the right of a military spy to be considered a prisoner of war if captured in uniform, and his fate—the fate of André—if taken in disguise. By custom the hospital-flag in a siege protects the building over which it floats, though it is sometimes found to have covered a magazine; and non-combatants, in the train of an enemy, enjoy a certain immunity, albeit in this respect military usage has not always been strong enough to maintain its ground. When Mr. Larpent, much to the amusement of the troops, was captured by the French, he was told that he had no chance of being released without exchange, though entitled to be set at liberty 'according to the known and anciently practised rules of war;' and it was fortunate for him that the Duke had made prize of a secretary or two, among whom the French could

take their choice. The respect due to a flag of truce, and the duty of the bearer of it to wait for a signal, to carry no arms, and abstain scrupulously from any abuse of the safeguard it affords, have been sharply discussed in the present war; we have demanded satisfaction, and (at Odessa) taken revenge. But the dispute in each case was about facts only, the principles being admitted on both sides.

And the more finished the machine, the better it seconds that workmanlike habit of proportioning the means to the end, which is a characteristic of modern times. With an instrument that does its work cleanly, and readily obeys the hand, the operations of war may be so planned and executed as to avoid, in a remarkable degree, all needless violence and the infliction of gratuitous suffering. Take the late performances of our fleets in the Baltic and the Sea of Azoff. The business in hand is the destruction of stores (which are virtually magazines), of the timber and tar wherewith the enemy renews his fleets, and the grain, flour, and fish, which feed his army. Two or three steamers drop anchor before the place, and a flag of truce is sent ashore to offer terms. All government property is to be surrendered, and the troops removed to a spot within sight, and five miles off. The inhabitants to withdraw, except those appointed by the authorities to assist in opening the stores. Any infraction of the terms to be punished with instant bombardment. One hour for decision. A categorical answer required. If resistance is attempted, it is subdued; if not, there is a saving of time and powder, and of some broken heads and limbs. Here is a sample of the *modus operandi* in the latter alternative. The scene is the town of Gheisk, the narrative a published extract from an officer's diary.

"About 10 a.m. the flag of truce returned, with intelligence that the Governor had surrendered the town and government property, according to terms, they not having any artillery, but only a few troops to oppose us; but it was the wish of the Governor that the boats should pull in close to the shore and form order of battle in line abreast, making an imposing appearance, so as to justify him in his conduct,—which we did. The marines and firing party landed, and were received by the Governor and Colonel, providing the officers with mounts. One party proceeded to the westward, and fired some mile-and-a-half of stacks, consisting of hay, rye, and straw, in places six and eight deep; others to the town, to fire a quantity of grain that the Governor had taken out of the stores to prevent the town being burnt, which they were in great fear of. The Governor requested us to pitch the hay over the cliff in lieu of setting fire to it—a modest request, rather, to pitch a mile-and-a-half of stacks over; it would have taken our party about two

months. The parties having destroyed the grain and stacks which they took to be government property, re-embarked, but previous to their leaving the beach, the Governor begged their acceptance of a quantity of stock, which he had ordered down to the beach, which we politely declined. Compliments passed—such as that they hoped they would meet each other under more favourable auspices in lieu of such painful circumstances. The Governor and inhabitants were thankful for our leniency in sparing the town. About this time one dozen of champagne came down very apropos in a drosky, which seemingly our friend the Governor had ordered, and which he insisted upon our opening and drinking each other's healths. Two very swell Greeks, dressed up gaudily in their war costume, were not content with drinking healths only, but drunk success to the expedition, in French. I suppose our friend the Governor did not understand them. Thus ends the destruction of government property at Gheisk."

Picture to yourself the descent of a fleet on a hostile coast four centuries ago: the loud alarm rung out from tower and steeple as the dreaded sails broke the line of the horizon—the hasty arming with weapons snatched from wall and chimney-corner—the flight of the feeble and helpless—the stout defence, beaten down by numbers—the havoc, ruin, and despair; and then think of our handful of blue-jackets peaceably parading the streets, and searching for suspicious stores, cracking, the while, their harmless jokes upon the 'Rooshians,' attended by the authorities, eyed by the inhabitants, complimented with champagne, and appeased with beer. Is this war? Yes; it is an operation strictly confined to a specific object, which it accomplishes with entire success; and the contrast is the same as between that sergeant of the Coldstreams whom you met this morning in the Park—the respectable-looking man in red, whose square upright carriage, steady eye, and air of quiet resolute self-possession reminded you at once of the desk and the parade, and the rugged dissolute man-at-arms of olden times.

If what has been said needs any qualification, it is this. The growth of professionalism tends naturally—though less in soldiership than in other pursuits—to banish high-minded and chivalrous sentiment, and establish a medium standard of principle and practice. Less in soldiership, because here the professional standard itself is in some respects a most exalted one, demanding nothing less than the nicest honour and the most absolute self-devotion. Yet Henry V., if he had lived in the nineteenth century, would not have granted four days' grace—no, nor one—to a besieged city expecting to be relieved; on the other hand, he would not, when that city surrendered, have beheaded as rebels men who never were his subjects, or expelled

a multitude of helpless women from house and home. The mechanical and commercial spirit, again, sees too clearly the work to be done, and the shortest way to do it, to be in its own nature merciful or generous; it is apt to be impatient of scruples as well as disdainful of forms. The ceremonial of the law of war has been curtailed. Fecials and heralds, solemn* defiances, declarations of hostilities, and summonses to surrender, have disappeared, together with usages which, like the 'Truces of the Lord,' and perhaps the liberty allowed to students to resort from hostile countries to their accustomed universities, belong rather to a state of society in which war is at once chronic and desultory. There was a time when sovereigns stipulated with each other against the use of chain-shot,† and a keen controversy raged among military men towards the end of the seventeenth century about the lawfulness of a sort of huge bomb-ship which was employed at the siege of Antwerp. Now invention racks itself to produce the biggest gun, the deadliest projectile, the most frightful engine of whole-

---

* Not wholly, perhaps, at sea. The *Shannon's* challenge to the *Chesapeake* was a model of a cartel—spirited, straightforward, courteous. The defiance sent down by the Jamaica Maroons, at the opening of what was called the Maroon War of 1795 (*Lives of the Lindsays*, ii. 38), is not a bad specimen, notwithstanding a little confusion of the parts of speech:—

'Gentlemen,—The Maroons desires nothing else from the country but battle, and they desires not to see Mr. Craskell here at all. So they are waiting every moment for the above on Monday.

(Signed) Colonel Montague, and all the rest.

Mr. David Schaw will see you on Sunday morning for an answer. } They will wait till Monday nine o'clock, and if they don't come up, they will come down themselves.'

Mr. Craskell was an obnoxious superintendent.

† Red-hot shot was objected to at first. The Spanish sailors captured at the siege of Gibraltar complained that their officers had told them it was an unlawful means of defence. Then a somewhat fine distinction was taken. 'An instrument of war,' said Lord Balcarras, defending the employment of dogs against the Maroons, 'is in one case fair, in another unfair. Why do the laws and customs of war authorize a fort to fire red-hot shot, and deny it to a ship of war? The reason is obvious; the one is defence, the other aggression. It is upon that principle that I used the instrument in question in Jamaica. It is upon that principle I have refused it to St. Domingo, who offered to reimburse that island the expense, provided they could get the dogs.' —(*Lives of the Lindsays*, iii. 135.) The true excuse, however, for his canine auxiliaries was that his enemies made war like wild beasts, and might therefore be put down by any means which would stop (as the fear imposed by the dogs effectually did) the effusion of blood. His distinction as to red-hot shot is exploded. Our batteries have used it against the ships in Sebastopol harbour, which were, *pro tempore*, part of the fortifications.

sale slaughter, and the shallows of Kertch and Cronstadt are planted thickly with infernal machines. It is possible to go too fast and too far in this direction. The quickest road to victory is not always the best, and even a certain saving in the sum-total of bloodshed and suffering may be too dearly bought by the use of means which shock the instincts of humanity.

This should be borne in mind when we come to the acknowledged blots on modern warfare—the refusal of egress to the inhabitants of blockaded cities, the sack of stormed towns, and the seizure and confiscation of private property at sea. It may be assumed, perhaps, that an *English* general commanding a blockading army would now imitate the example of Henry IV. before Paris rather than that of Frederick II. at Prague, and would not refuse a passage through his lines to the innocent sufferers on whom the chief pressure falls, since the effect of such a refusal is to make the direct infliction of torture and death on non-combatants a means of obtaining the ends of war. It differs not much, in fact, from what Suchet did at Lerida, when he drove the citizens along with the garrison into the castle, and threw shells into the crowd till the commandant surrendered. The two pleas for pillage—the impossibility of preventing it, and the necessity of holding out some reward to the soldier—have both been disposed of by Sir W. Napier. Of the second, it is enough to say that no object, however great, no cause, however holy, no argument which the mind can frame, can make it lawful to bribe men to face death by promising riotous indulgence to cupidity, rage, and lust. Whatever may be justifiable in war, this is not. As to the first, nothing is impossible till it has been tried. Difficult it would be, no doubt. 'Chose merveilleuse,' says the Duke of Berwick of the escape of Barcelona, which surrendered at discretion after a successful assault—'chose merveilleuse qu'une ville prise d'assaut ne fût pas pillée. L'on ne peut attribuer qu'à Dieu, car tout le pouvoir des hommes n'aurait jamais pu contenir le soldat.' He had bidden the besieged keep up a show of resistance till his arrangements were made, then beat the *générale*, and marched his troops to their allotted quarters without a man quitting the ranks. 'It has fallen to my lot,' said the Duke of Wellington, chafing under the reproaches heaped upon him after the fall of San Sebastian, 'to take many towns by storm, and I am concerned to add that I never saw or heard of one so taken by any troops that it was not plundered.'* It is true, at any rate, that there has been little improvement in this matter. The tales which Napier says he heard at English

* *Dispatches*, 9th October, 1813.

picquet-fires from actors in the last and most terrible of the Peninsular sieges resembled but too closely the details collected by Brantôme's prurient curiosity of the sack of Rome. But Napier's informants related with grief and anger scenes which were 'particularitez fort plaisantes' to Brantôme; and the noble indignation of our great military historian is a relief after the 'Bref, ce fust un vilain scandale!' of the profligate courtier of the seventeenth century.* The sack of Constantine by the French in 1837 lasted three days. It was impossible to help it, wrote St. Arnaud, who was in the thick of the assault, to his brother at Paris: 'Rien n'arrêtait le soldat; il était victorieux, il avait beaucoup souffert, il avait acheté sa conquête au prix de son sang, il y aurait eu folie de vouloir l'arrêter.' He adds that the officers took part in it, and that it turned out eventually 'comme toujours,' that the 'tête d'armée' and the staff had got the best of the spoil.† Difficult it must be. Discipline is at an end when the victorious soldiery pour pell-mell down from the breach they have climbed through blood and fire—men of different regiments mixed together, their officers killed or disabled—mad with excitement, and deaf to threats, because insensible to fear. The best thing that can be done with them is to get them out of the way as fast as possible, and relieve them with fresh troops. According to the Duke, this would have been done at San Sebastian, but for the simultaneous attack made by the French on the left of the British army. But is it the only thing? Napier's suggestion, that plundering should be made criminal by the Articles of War, that a special corps should follow the stormers, charged to assist in preserving order, and that the men engaged should be paid a gratuity in lieu of booty on the spot, look practicable enough to the unprofessional mind, and the last of them would satisfy the feeling (which has helped, I suspect, to make the difficulty seem an impossibility) that restraint, if it could be enforced, would rob the soldier of his due. His due, however, it is not. Hostile property taken in an enemy's town, whether stormed or not

* Here are Brantôme's gravest reflections on the subject:—'Certes, a ce qu'il me conta, les insolences y furent trop excescives, et si feu M. de Bourbon eust survescu il les eut bien corrigez; car c'estoit un capitaine sage et advisé, politic, et avoit l'âme si chrestienne qu'il n'eust voulu recevoir aucun reproche, encor qu'il aymast le soldat et l'eust voulu contenter, mais selon le droict de guerre et après plus; car pour continuer le sac tant de temps il n'y avoit point raison, *et aussi ledict M. de Bourbon eust voulu faire bource à part et estant ainsy ceste ville saccagée de fonds en comble il n'eust sçeu.*'—i. 177.

† *Lettres du Maréchal St. Arnaud*, ii. 141.

(like the stores in Sebastopol), is by custom treated as prize, and the value of it usually distributed among the troops, but on the goods of private persons they have no claim. The true state of the case is this. The old *droict de la guerre* survives in this sense, that an enemy has no right to complain of the exercise of it, but efforts are now made to restrain and punish pillage,* and it is only to be wished that those efforts should be more vigorous and effective in future. Let them prove successful, and that which is forbidden by the internal regulations of armies will soon be proscribed by the general usages of war.

Influences different from any of those above referred to have presided over the birth and development of the law of naval warfare. It has grown up a mixed system, with a two-fold aspect, partly amid the wild rough freedom of the blue water, partly under the care of grave judges sitting in quiet courts, and assisted by a select and erudite bar. It appeals to precedents. It is studied in reports. It has the definite symmetrical outlines of a regular branch of jurisprudence. And of the two codes, the one made by generals, the other by judges, the latter is the harshest; the latter shows least concern for those private rights which are the offspring and peculiar charge of the Law. Private property, which is sacred on dry land, is lawful booty at sea; private industry and commerce are the objects against which naval hostilities are principally carried on. I do not mean to charge the responsibility of this on my own profession. No one, indeed, can have acquainted himself, however superficially, with the law of prize and blockade, without being struck by the nice sense of fairness and justice, the accurate logic, the minute and conscien-

* Voltaire says that in his time an officer who should deliberately give up a place to pillage would be as much disgraced as one who refused to be second in a duel would have been in the previous century. Such efforts were made, by one officer at least, at Constantine, as they were at Badajoz and San Sebastian, but soon relinquished. It is always to be borne in mind that the positive laws of war, like the laws of honour or of etiquette, are the creatures of use, though founded in reason and convenience—are kept alive by tradition, and perish when they become obsolete. It is not, therefore, to be assumed that because a particular usage was received as a *droict* and sanctioned by military text-books a hundred years ago, it possesses authority now. If it has not been kept up, and is at variance with the ideas and general practice of a later age, it has been tacitly abrogated. The caution is necessary, because historians, who glean their knowledge from books, and soldiers, who usually adopt the traditions of the age preceding their own, are very apt to ascribe greater fixity to these 'laws' than they really deserve; and we sometimes see great barbarities excused by appeals to ancient fragments of the military code which have been really obliterated by time.

tious care, with which it has been moulded into form—chiefly in this country and by that great man whose seat Dr. Lushington has shown himself, as an Admiralty Judge, not unworthy to fill. These very excellences, however, combined with the tendency of the forensic spirit to harden and stereotype all that it touches, have probably assisted to perpetuate the system itself, the main framework of which has acquired strength and stability as minor grievances have been pruned away and subordinate questions settled on sound and equitable principles. All judges are naturally Conservative in their own sphere; they uphold the law which they administer; and elementary assumptions, which have been reasoned on as true, and furnished the groundwork for many decisions, gain sacredness by lapse of time. But the causes which really shaped out that system, and to which its general character is due, are not of course to be sought for in Doctors' Commons.

Waged, as it is and must be, chiefly between trading nations —for a State which has no traffic has no ships, unless it exists by piracy,—the rivalries, conquests, and gradual extension of trade have been, as we should expect them to be, prime agents in modifying the law of maritime war. Trade is orderly, and rests on a basis of mutual compact. A certain stamp of orderliness, arising from conventions and treaties, the 'custom of merchants,' and the general consent of seafaring people, seems to have impressed itself very early on this kind of warfare, even amidst the piratical licence then prevalent on the wide and lonely ocean, which owned no ruler, and whose depths told no tales. The customs and usages of the Mediterranean States—'les bones costumes de la mar'—were compiled in the form now extant as early at least as the close of the fourteenth century, and that compilation forms the groundwork of the present maritime law of Europe. Trade is selfish and aggressive, and (wherever it can be so) domineering; you see in commercial legislation a constant struggle to reconcile its jealousies with its necessities, its larger with its narrower views of its own interests; and the same thing may, I believe, be traced in the history of all maritime contests for the last three centuries. The deputations which have beset Lord Clarendon, urging him to stop this channel of traffic or open that, to grant or refuse licences, to enforce blockades, illustrate the working of the interior influences by which this policy is shaped, sometimes into strangely irregular forms. Trade again multiples the points of contact with foreign States; naval Powers, when they fall out, grapple with each other, not on their own ground, where the fray would be comparatively harmless to all but themselves, but on that common

highway, the sea, in the midst of a busy crowd of buyers and sellers, who must be scattered right and left to make a ring. Hence the great bulk of the law maritime relates to the rights of neutrals—the protection due to strangers and lookers-on; and it is in extending and securing this protection that the *civilising* influences of the spread of trade have chiefly made themselves felt. These influences, however, have had much to contend with, and their progress has been difficult and slow. Hostilities by sea were long waged principally by private adventurers, or associations of merchants, without any regular authority from the sovereign. In later times came the sanguinary and lawless struggles to maintain and break down a commercial monopoly, carried on without truce or intermission among tropical islands and on strange seas, which followed the discovery of America and the Cape passage. Then the continual wars for colonies, commerce, and the balance of power, waged in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries by England, France, Spain, and Holland, all interested in maintaining the rights of belligerents whilst destroying the shipping and seizing the markets of each other. Then the rapid fall of Spain, the decline of Holland, the steady and incessant rise of Great Britain, contested by France keenly but in vain. And for a very long time our preponderance has been such as to enable us practically to treat our own will as law, whilst it has made our prize-courts the prize-courts of the world. There can be no doubt that such a distribution of naval power is not in itself favourable to the growth of a mild and equitable maritime code. All that can be said is—and history, I think, will some day say it for us, though it is not now generally admitted by our Continental neighbours—that our great strength has on the whole been used with moderation, and that the 'judicial legislation' of our tribunals has been governed almost uniformly by that sense of high and enlarged responsibility which should be present to the mind of a judge sitting in a court, not of English, but of public law.

Observe, again, how the various and shifting interests of different States have operated to frustrate the attainment of any general consent among them, and prevent the multitude of separate conventions which have been concluded from acquiring solid and permanent value. The Dutch, who were the first to attempt 'a paper blockade,' protested most loudly against the same thing when turned against them by other Powers. Whilst they had the carrying trade of Europe, they laboured with characteristic perseverance to substitute the principle that the flag covers the cargo for the old rule of the Consolato del Mare; the continental States, weak at sea, adopted it with

alacrity for the most part, though, when engaged in war, they often abandoned it themselves; England has resisted it, because in such contests she is almost always a principal, whilst it has been her policy that her own commerce should be carried on mainly under her own flag. When the townsmen of St. Malo could boast, as they watched from their high old walls the sun set behind the rocky islets that guard the entrance to the port, that their nest of privateers did more harm to the trade of England than the whole French navy, France had an interest in keeping up privateering. The American Union, with its small and cheaply maintained naval force, its vast commercial marine, and daring, restless people, has, or thinks it has, the same now; and some recollections, perhaps, still survive there of those profitable cruisings on the highway between Europe and the West Indies which made Franklin fear lest 'a new Barbary should rise in America, and our long extended coast be occupied by piratical states.' Jealousy of England was at the bottom of the first Armed Neutrality, the members of which, when they quarrelled amongst themselves, renounced the very principle which they had been leagued to maintain; and blind hatred of the same obnoxious Power instigated the blows aimed at neutral commerce by the French Republic and Empire, which we retaliated on a greater scale, till America thrust herself between, and gave weight to her remonstrances by closing all her ports against Europe. No chapter of history has a more instructive bearing on my subject than that which comprises the Berlin and Milan Decrees, the Orders in Council, the Convention of Morfontaine, and the second American War. Since the commencement of the present century, indeed, the growth of the Transatlantic Republic has been the great fact for the statesman as well as for the thoughtful student of history and public law. Neutral hitherto in European contests, but trading everywhere,—feeding the machinery, and helping to feed the mouths, of the Old World,—irritably sensitive of affronts, and strong enough (in all the elements of strength) to make her resentment feared, she is the natural and most powerful protectress of neutral rights, and her influence goes for much in the concessions which have been wisely made in the present war. She has changed already, and is daily shifting more and more, the balance of naval power. Her prospects are dim, her friendship is precarious, her policy uncertain; all that is certain about her is, that with her immense seaboard, vast population, and keen spirit of enterprise, she is destined to engross a larger and larger share of the trade and shipping of the world. And it is a fact of more than historical interest,

that she is almost the only power which has ever stipulated, or ever proposed, that private property afloat under a hostile flag should be exempt from capture.

'Try, my friend (wrote Franklin to Hartley, in 1783), what you can do in procuring for your nation the glory of being, though the greatest naval power, the first who voluntarily relinquished the advantage that power seems to give them, of plundering others, and thereby impeding the natural communication among men of the gifts of God, and rendering miserable multitudes of merchants and their families, artizans and cultivators of the earth, the most peaceable and innocent part of the human species.'

The clause which the 'Quaker notions' (and possibly the foresight) of that homely but shrewd diplomatist, led him to suggest to the British Government, and which, as he said himself, he rather wished than expected to see adopted, he contrived, two years afterwards, to embody in a treaty with Prussia:—

All merchants or traders, with their unarmed vessels, employed in commerce, exchanging the products of different places, and thereby rendering the necessaries, conveniences, and comforts of life more easy to obtain and more general, shall be allowed to pass freely unmolested.

This treaty expired in 1789. It was not renewed, and was never exposed to the rough test of actual war. The experiment had, however, been twice made,—by the Dutch, in 1552, as a concession to France, and by Louis XV., in 1673, towards Spain. And France and England, even in their last and fiercest struggle, agreed to give protection to the fishermen of the Channel. A proposition nearly identical with Franklin's clause was laid, in 1792, before the Legislative Assembly of the French Republic, by a committee of which M. Kersaint was chairman, but was defeated by the eloquence of Vergniaux. I do not know whether the subject has been formally mooted on any other occasion, or whether the change which Franklin desired to see introduced has any other authority in its favour, except that of the Abbé de Mably (and, I believe, Galiani), and a couple of sentences—also in the optative mood—in the works of Emerigon and Wheaton. On the other hand, there is a pretty general consensus against it; and the very few attempts which have been made to advocate it, have been met with the same contemptuous severity with which Valin rebukes those mean-spirited theorists who ventured, in his day, to argue against privateering. I have not room here for more than a glance at the question, which appears to me to have been disposed of rather more hastily than it deserves.

There is no difficulty in understanding how it is that a

system which has disappeared on land has hitherto survived at sea. Pillage ashore wastes the resources of a country, exasperates the inhabitants, occasions barbarities of every kind, and ruins discipline. The general of an invading army feels interested, therefore, in suppressing it to the utmost of his power. But these objections do not apply, or apply in an infinitely less degree, to pillage at sea. A merchantman comes in sight, is chased, and, after a long shot or two, submits to her fate; a prize crew is sent on board, and navigates her home. If the sailors, as frequently happens, are set at liberty without exchange, the chief sufferer is the owner or insurer. It must be added, that commercial jealousy, which has too often instigated or embittered maritime wars, has seen in the destruction of the enemy's trade and shipping, not merely a means, but an end. Thus the practice has come down to us nearly unchanged from times when such wars, with all their 'good customs,' were little better than a kind of piracy,—when no commission was deemed necessary to warrant a capture, or sentence of condemnation to legalize it, and the armed trader who sailed from Yarmouth or Rostock would have joined chorus with Mephistopheles and his three comrades,—

> 'Man fragt um's Was, und nicht um's Wie;
> Ich müsste keine Schifffahrt kennen;
> Krieg, Handel, und Piraterie,
> Dreieinig sind sie, nicht zu trennen.'

It now helps to keep alive the proposition maintained by savages and lawyers—by savages because it suits their habits, by lawyers because it is technically necessary to give a legal title to property which has changed hands by capture,—that the goods of the vanquished are the absolute property of the victor. Meanwhile, however, the counter-proposition,—that private property should, as far as possible, be deemed inviolable, and every effort directed against the forces, establishments, and possessions of *the State*,—has, by the combined influences of humanity and convenience, become an integral part of the general law of war. I shall say a word on the reason of that by and by; the fact nobody denies. When Napoleon seized the goods of English merchants at Leghorn, the act was condemned by all Europe. Why? Because they were private property. The burden of proof, therefore, lies with those who defend the exception.

The simplest and most usual argument for it is, that we take men's goods at sea because there is nothing else to be taken. 'Among the solitary recesses of the deep,' says Alison, 'you will search in vain for the populous cities or fertile fields

which reward the valour of terrestrial ambition.' There is no denying that. The ocean has been a desert since the days of Homer, and he who should push his conquests in that quarter, could hope for no more solid acquisition than an oyster-bed or a forest of Turkey sponge. But the rightful object of war is not acquisition, but satisfaction. To treat it as a means of getting booty, whether that booty be provinces and towns, or cargoes of silks and sundries, is to throw us back into downright barbarism. Hence, the latest writers on this subject, MM. Pistoye and Duverdy,* though strenuous defenders of the right of capture and confiscation, reject a view which is substantially Sir A. Alison's, as rank communism, — the hardest word that a modern French lawyer can find to throw at the thing he disapproves the most.

Nor can it be contended that these seizures are in themselves a mode of obtaining that reparation which every belligerent claims. Captured property which the State, by invariable custom, gives up to the captors, could never be regarded in that light, except by the merest fiction. The excuse sometimes offered, that ships and sailors are the *matériel* of naval war, might serve two centuries ago, when any good-sized craft could be fitted with guns and added at once to the fleet, but it will not do now; and it seems hard (to say the least) that peaceable sea-faring men should be seized and shut up in prison, for no better reason than that they may possibly enter their country's service hereafter.

The only serious argument is, that the distress inflicted on the enemy's commerce and the pressure on his resources, are legitimate means of reducing him to submission. Private property, it is urged, is not absolutely sacred; if it suffers from the necessary operations of war, the owner must resort to his own government for compensation. And it is added, that the interests of humanity, and of commerce itself, are best served by hastening, at whatever cost to individuals, the return of peace. Hostilities which hurt nobody may go on for ever. There is something suspicious in a conclusion based on these vague generalities, which may be, and indeed have been, pushed much farther, and used to justify the greatest crimes. It is not so easy as this argument assumes it to be, to poise the evil which this way of carrying on war causes against that which it saves. That it often sensibly distresses an enemy, is certain. So, no doubt, would ravage and devastation ashore. We all remember the picture which Aristophanes draws of life in Athens during the annual incursions of the Lacedæmonian army, — the old

* *Traité des Prises Maritimes.* Paris, 1855.

yeoman, cooped up in the dull town, and pining for the wholesome plenty and familiar pleasures of the country,—the piteous regrets for rifled gardens and bullocks driven away, and the weary longings for peace; we feel the truth as well as humour of the scene, and can understand that any philosopher who should have suggested to King Archidamus that it would be better to give up ravaging, would have got a disagreeable answer. We have given it up, however, even in cases where it could be done without the least injury to the discipline or resources of the invading army; and what was legitimate campaigning then, would be a series of rude and brutal forays now. And is it always easy to comprehend why the same boat's crew must respect on land the selfsame goods which are lawful prize at sea, or why it is an honourable exploit to seize, in some petty Baltic seaport, a merchant schooner loading at a wharf—a cargo of salt, the winter's supply of a village—or a boat-load of fish, the venture of a poor family, creeping along shore to its accustomed market—and a misdemeanour to go ten steps further, enter the owner's house, and take his furniture and money? If, however, the advantages of the practice are ambiguous, and the distinction on which it proceeds somewhat obscure, the principle which it violates is settled and plain. Every one understands the line drawn between striking at the State blows which incidentally and unavoidably injure the persons or property of individuals, and striking at individuals point-blank as a means of pressure on the State. The calamity falls, in the latter case, with capricious severity on unoffending people, peaceably and industriously employed; it ruins a few, and leaves the rest untouched; and the greatest sufferers are often those whom we should most wish to spare; whilst the effect upon the governing power (which is really aimed at) is indirect, uncertain, and produced at a disproportionate cost of loss and suffering to one or both parties. We have been spectators, hitherto, of maritime warfare in its most orderly and least repulsive form,—that of a general blockade, more or less effective, of the whole Russian coast. The number of Russian merchantmen actually taken has been insignificant, and our own are as safe as if we were at peace with all the world. But it is a very different matter when waged between two Powers each possessing an extensive marine. Such a war makes a lottery of our naval service, and a gambling speculation of our foreign trade. Opening at random the *Annual Register* for 1760, I find that 'the captures made by the French from the 1st of March to the 10th of June, were as follow:—32 in March, 47 in April, 80 in May, besides 5 ransomers, and

42 in June; total 202 ships.' In 1758 (another year taken at random), the French captured 300 of our merchant-ships, we 104 of theirs. There is nothing to show that either of these was more than an average take,—more probably they were below the average, for during those two years we were masters of the Channel,—but we may imagine the stimulus which they would give to the Bankruptcy Courts of Liverpool and London. On the other side, within a twelvemonth after the peace, there were 120 failures in Bordeaux. We are threatened, whilst I am writing, with an American war, and every man, I suppose, has dimly realized to himself the immense waste and ruin which must ensue, should the busy ocean highway—now crossed in every direction by broad tides of traffic, wafting to each hemisphere the products of the other—be abandoned to swarms of commissioned freebooters, in the shape of cruisers and privateers. A salutary terror, do you say? Perhaps so. It may be just reasoning to say in the same breath that war should be a dreadful thing to deter us from engaging in it, and that we ought to be deterred from it *because* it is a dreadful thing. In China it is thought desirable that litigation should be costly and oppressive, to prevent people from going to law; but here we find it the best way to diminish social evils as much as we can, instead of leaving them huge and ugly to frighten mankind. I know very well that war (which is the litigation of nations) must be fraught, however conducted, with enormous mischiefs. But to say that these particular evils are inseparable from it, and that this way of conducting it is the only possible way, is to beg the question. Nor do I now care to dispute that any mode of distressing the enemy, not plainly inhuman, unjust, or demoralizing, is lawful in the abstract. But the specific objections to the practice we are examining are these: First, that the ruin it inflicts falls capriciously and at haphazard on inoffensive persons, employed in the pursuit of a calling useful to mankind.* Secondly, that the injury to industry and the waste of capital—that is, of the means of sustaining life and labour—are excessive, in proportion to the advantage really obtained by the stronger over the weaker party. These objections, it may be said, apply also to blockades. In a much less

* It is no answer to this to say that the real sufferer is the insurer. If, however, in the case just supposed, a traffic of insurances were kept up between Liverpool and New York, as it was during the French wars of the last century between London and Marseilles, each nation would have the satisfaction of paying heavy premiums on its own commerce to the other, and reimbursing the other for the depredations of its own cruisers.

degree. The pressure inflicted by a blockade is felt, not by individuals, but by large classes; it attacks more directly and surely the *national* resources; it falls on the weaker party alone, and whilst, within certain defined limits, it paralyses trade, does not turn the *whole* commerce of *both* into a desperate game of chance. I should be glad to see it seriously considered, whether all commerce, belligerent as well as neutral, could not advantageously be placed on one and the same footing, as regards the law of blockade and contraband. There is no chance of this at present, and the doubts suggested here will probably be scouted as worse than paradoxical at a moment when we are struggling hard to make *some* use of our naval strength against an enemy who will not come to close quarters. But I state them because I am persuaded that, as commerce grows more potent, and its ramifications more intricate, and the free-trade axiom—that the industry of each nation contributes to the wealth of all—is more thoroughly understood, the subject will force itself forward, and extort, perhaps at an inconvenient time, the attention which it does not meet with now.

The concessions actually made in this war are well known. We have waived for the present the right of seizing hostile goods under neutral flags. We have commissioned no privateers. Russian vessels lying in our ports have been allowed a reasonable time to clear out, and the Queen's subjects have been in effect permitted to trade, by the help of neutrals, with the Queen's enemies; the only exception being the usual prohibition to export articles reckoned as contraband of war. The list of contraband is practically a small one, and comprises, I believe, only arms, gunpowder, and marine boilers, engines, and portions of engines, blue lias, cement, and lead. The French Government kept pace with us, and Russia as promptly responded. It was distinctly stated at the same time that there would be no 'paper' blockades, and the declaration issued on the breaking out of hostilities by most of the neutral members of the European family—by Denmark, Sweden, Austria, Hamburgh, Lubeck, the Two Sicilies, and Tuscany, promising respect to 'blockades effectifs,' and by implication refusing it to non-effective ones, were but so many simultaneous recognitions of a principle valuable to the weak, and now formally admitted by the strong.

The policy of some of these measures was sharply criticised. The jurist, jealous of the time-honoured tradition of the English Admiralty Courts, saw it with displeasure sacrificed, out of deference to France and America, to the opposite principle, which had been struggling to supplant it for two hundred

years. The statesman complained that we did not hit Russia hard enough by injuring her trade; the merchant, that his calculations were frustrated and his exertions discouraged when tallow and hemp from Memel, rye from Archangel, and linseed from the Black Sea, continued to compete with the articles which he had been at pains to procure from dearer and more distant sources of supply. The substance of the answer was, that you cannot help it; that Russian tallow is so much like other tallow, or so easily convertible into stearine and what not, that it would defy, if prohibited, all the vigilance of the custom-house; and that certificates of origin only offer a premium to wholesale perjury and fraud. Coupling this reply with the promise which always attends it, to blockade as closely as ships and gun-boats can the whole Russian coast, it will be observed that the permission to import becomes a simple refusal to battle with impossibilities by inefficacious measures of prohibition. As such, however, it has its importance, and marks some ground lost in the struggle which war has to maintain against the subtle expansive activity of trade. The other concessions have, as precedents for future wars, a more definite value, and fairly entitle the government by which they were made to the merit claimed for it by Sir J. Graham, of having materially mitigated the pressure of hostilities on industry and commerce. We have only to remember that the worth of a precedent depends on two things—the applicability of it to the general run of cases, and the acceptance which it finds. The exceptional features of the present contest are, that it is carried on by two naval nations in close alliance, and surrounded by a large circle of neutrals, against an enemy whose maritime strength we can paralyse, and whose entire coast we can blockade. It would be useless to us, for instance, in such a contest, to issue letters of marque. This is the only point on which Russia has been silent; whilst the American Government has positively refused to 'listen to any proposition' for the suppression of a practice on which it evidently counts as a cheap substitute for a regular navy.

Coast warfare, carried on by ships against the ports and seaboard of an enemy, has a character of its own. There is no such thing, strictly speaking, as a decisive operation at sea; a belligerent beaten twenty times over is only beaten,—not subdued; and the victorious fleet, after establishing its superiority on its own element, has nothing left to attempt but wearisome blockades and hasty descents. Towns, if captured, cannot be held; they can only be plundered, put to ransom, or destroyed, with no other result than to distress the inhabitants, and enrich the officers and men engaged. These are,

in fact, the border forays of maritime nations, and they were perfectly legitimate as such, in times when regular hostilities by land were but incursions on a more imposing scale. In the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth centuries, when French and Spaniards harassed our southern coasts, every place not strong enough to resist them met with the fate alluded to in a preceding page; the town was sacked and set on fire, the principal inhabitants often hung over their own doors, and the environs ravaged, till, disturbed by the approach of some neighbouring knight or baron who had raised the country against them, the invaders regained their ships and hoisted sail to seek fresh booty elsewhere. By and by there is a change for the better. It was deemed an act of singular humanity in the Earl of Essex, after taking Cadiz, in 1596, to permit the citizens to ransom themselves in the lump, and depart in English ships to a place of safety before the pillage began; they took with them nothing but the clothes they wore, though the 'heroical liberality' of Essex permitted some 'ancient gentlewomen' (to whom the necessity of choosing was perhaps too cruel a trial) to put on two or three best gowns.* But this was a fleet which sailed with strict injunctions to be merciful; manned by sailors to whom it was deemed necessary to interdict disputes on matters of religion, unless they had doubts to suggest to the chaplains; the same orders which bade them attack wealthy places only, capable of affording spoil enough to repay the cost of the expedition, directed the celebration of Divine service on shipboard twice a-day; and in the public thanksgiving offered on their return, it was considered worthy of special notice that clemency had been shown to helpless and unresisting persons. Cadiz, however, after being sacked, was, with the exception of the churches and religious houses, entirely destroyed. Follow, a century and a half afterwards, an English fleet to the coast of France, and you find another change, greater still. The squadron which swept that coast in 1694 bombarded every town within reach, but the instructions of Hawke and Mordaunt, in 1756, were limited to the destruction of docks, shipping, arsenals, and magazines, and Bligh and Marlborough, at Cherbourg and St. Malo, confined themselves to those specific objects, with the levying of 'the usual contributions.' Three thousand pounds were exacted from Cherbourg. Booty, however, was still a primary object of the expeditions despatched against the rich cities of the Western World: that excellent officer and kind-hearted man, Lord Anson, had a few years before deliberately burnt, the Governor

* Marbeck, quoted in Southey's *Naval History of England*, iv. 61.

refusing to ransom it, a large town in Peru; and the more prudent people of Manilla, shortly after, escaped a similar fate only by promising an enormous sum, which, as the readers of *Junius* know, was never paid. The American war of 1812 had a character of its own. The orders given to Admiral Cochrane to 'destroy and lay waste,' in revenge (it was said) for Newark,—the quantities of tobacco and other goods carried away,—the villages burnt, wherever the people, irregularly trained and armed, attempted, in obedience to their Government, a spirited but useless resistance,—the destruction of the Capitol, presidential residence, and other buildings at Washington,*—gave rise to bitter complaints in America and severe animadversion at home. But this was the utmost extent of the 'devastation' inflicted; Cockburn's squadron, as has been before observed, purchased its supplies at market prices, and, where no resistance was offered, laid hands on nothing but naval and ordnance stores, merchandize, and shipping. The operations of the fleets employed to distress the coasts of Russia and Finland have been conducted on much the same principle, but far more mildly. Whether 'merchandize' not actually shipped has been seized, I do not know; care has certainly been taken, except in one notable case in the White Sea, to avoid injuring private habitations; no contributions have been levied; and though, of the stores destroyed much must have belonged to private owners and been destined to private uses, though orders may here and there have been too broadly given or too roundly executed, nothing seems to have been sacrificed which would not have been available for the support of Russian fleets or armies. Even Odessa, fair and opulent, basking on her sunny slope, has flaunted unhurt before a great fleet, baffled and panting for action, her almost defenceless charms. In one particular only, the practice needs to be more strictly defined than it seems to have been hitherto. The destruction of public buildings of a civil nature can never

* Sir G. Cockburn's own account, in his official despatch, is that a 'heavy fire of musketry was opened on the troops from the Capitol and the adjoining houses,' which were therefore burnt. General Ross merely enumerates the former among the 'public buildings' destroyed. The President's Message for the year made the most of it. 'The enemy,' said Mr. Madison, 'has avowed his purpose of trampling on all the usages of civilized warfare, and given earnest of it in the plunder and wanton destruction of private property. In the pride of maritime dominion and thirst of commercial monopoly, he strikes with peculiar animosity at the progress of our arts and manufactures. His barbarous policy has not even spared those monuments of the arts and models of taste with which our country has embellished its infant metropolis.' Complaints of this kind, more or less just, arise in all wars.

be necessary or useful for the prosecution of hostilities, which it can only exasperate and inflame.

The laws of war are glosses on, and developments of, these simple principles—that every operation should have a definite object; that it should be the belligerent's aim to attain that object at minimum cost to himself, and without inflicting wanton suffering on the subjects of the enemy; and that no object ought to be pursued at a cost which is out of all reasonable proportion to its value. War is a series of emergencies, and those who conduct it must be left, for the most part, to construe its primary rules for themselves; but it is well that this discretion, inevitably large,—this responsibility, necessarily heavy, should be abridged, as far as it conveniently can be, by opinion, precedent, and custom. No man, however wise and merciful, can always see the consequences of his own acts. The most sagacious statesman sometimes strikes a random blow; the ablest general can but roughly measure the evil he is about to cause against the advantage he hopes to gain. And every man in authority is not wise or merciful. A hard and reckless soldier, in a hard and reckless age, will raze a town for a purpose which would hardly warrant the burning of a farm-house, and depopulate a province for an end to which we might hesitate to sacrifice a few hundred stacks of corn. Even the elementary lesson, that cruelty exasperates more than it terrifies, and that hatred is a more enduring passion than fear, takes long to learn; for great barbarities, if they are only great enough, usually achieve, for the time at least, a certain measure of success. The temptation to think only of the present, to use superior force unscrupulously, and beat down obstinacy by ferocity, continually recurs. The pleadings of Mercy are low, and easily lost amid the roar and heat of battle; it is only when she can appeal to laws built on experience and consecrated by use that her gentle voice rises to accents of command, and she invests herself with the majesty which clothes the acknowledged principles of right. Loose and imperfect as they are, and often of doubtful authority, these laws secure, to a very great extent, courtesy and humanity betwixt enemies, and protection to non-combatants; they check ferocity, correct ignorance, and make forbearance possible, by ensuring that it shall be mutual.

The subject we have been glancing over is not attractive. It leads us through the gloomiest and saddest paths of history, shows us the dark side of the most shining exploits, and fastens our attention chiefly on miseries and crimes. Each age has its merciless soldiers and unfeeling statesmen; ambition spills more blood than cruelty; military science crowds together

greater multitudes for slaughter; civilization itself multiplies a thousandfold the means of destruction, and forges more tremendous implements of carnage; from every country on which the curse successively falls the cry of anguish and rage goes up to Heaven, whilst faint and broken are the glimpses we obtain of anything like recognised custom or established law. Generally speaking, indeed, it is only when such usages are violated and trodden under foot that they proclaim their existence at all. Can we wonder if, with the latest complaints sounding in their ears, and fresh scenes of violence floating before their eyes, thoughtful men ask doubtfully whether anything has been really done to mitigate these evils within the last two hundred years?* Nay, can we think it strange if, yielding to a kind of despair, they talk as if there were nothing to be done, nothing to be hoped for, but to make the calamity shorter at the cost of making it fiercer and more terrible? I do not feel that doubt. Time has, I think, done much, and will, I firmly hope, do much more. But there would be little ground for confidence, if we had nothing to rely upon but the public opinion of the day. The public opinion of an age is the mixed result of the working of its more thoughtful minds on the mass who do not so much think as feel: the public opinion of to-day or yesterday is a reflection of the last view that has gained a hearing, the last emotion of impatience, anger, pity, triumph, or disappointment, which has stirred the heart of the nation. The old Revolutionary Government of France began by

---

* In an article on Mr. Wheaton's *History of International Law*, in No. CXLVI. of the *Edinburgh Review*, Mr. Senior has expressed his opinion that there has been no improvement in this matter since the Peace of Westphalia. Mr. Wheaton thinks otherwise, and has not retracted in the latest edition of his work. Among the instances (none of them very cogent) on which Mr. Senior relies, is one which has been noticed in this essay as leading rather to an opposite conclusion—the sanguinary decrees of the French Directory. 'They were executed,' says Mr. Senior; and he refers to Barrere's boast that 'but one prisoner' was taken at the battle of Fleurus. But were they executed? 'The very contrary happened,' says the annalist of the *Annual Register* for 1794, 'to what had been proposed by Barrere. When, through the events of war, the English fell into the hands of the French, they treated them with the wonted humanity long practised by both nations.' And, in spite of Barrere, prisoners were certainly made at Fleurus. In the *Victoires et Conquêtes des Français de* 1792 *à* 1815, they are reckoned at 3000. This must be an exaggeration; but Soult, who was present, mentions that among them were several *emigrés*, whom their captors permitted to escape at night, 'not dreaming of the possibility of giving up to the executioner men whom they had encountered in the field.' (Soult, *Mem.* i. 170.) In fact, these decrees were made by civilians and disobeyed by soldiers.

renouncing the idea of conquest, and ended by seizing the fairest provinces of Italy,—busied itself, whilst at peace, with philanthropic projects for mitigating the ordinary evils of war, then rushed into the opposite extreme, and issued a series of edicts of which a tribe of naked savages might have been ashamed. We ourselves, without going back so far, know in what a variable and inflammable atmosphere we live, and have heard in this war, fifty times over, the popular voice calling out to ravage the enemy's coasts, and lay in ashes his commercial towns. It is of consequence that there should be a solid and established body of usages and traditions to resist these gusts of popular passion, as well as to curb the licence of armies in the field, and that the true principles on which alone war can lawfully be carried on should be diffused and understood. Especially ought this to be so in a country which is proud of its benevolence and refinement, and has itself suffered so little from calamities of this kind. We have no scenes of rapine, blood, and shame to revenge or to forget. No one, I think, can have travelled over the bare, undulating plains of central Germany, studded at intervals with small old towns, each huddled within its square wall and gray mouldering towers, like the background of an old picture, without a sense that he was indeed traversing the battle-field of Europe. No one but must have observed, as his eye strayed over some familiar English landscape, the careless freedom with which population has scattered itself over hill and dale, in every sheltered nook, and along every winding lane, and felt how the wreath of blue smoke floating upwards from the trees added, by suggesting faint images of peaceful life, a more than picturesque charm to the scene. Even our intestine quarrels, notwithstanding the torrents of blood shed in them, were a light scourge compared with the effects of war in neighbouring countries. This was noticed by Fortescue; it was noticed by De Commines; and Whitelocke, after the triumph of the Commonwealth, could tell Christina of Sweden that the storms which had convulsed the island had left hardly any visible marks of devastation behind. England ought surely in this matter to be an example to the world, and should be slow to inflict on others calamities which she herself has been mercifully spared. It is common, I know, to talk as if war were so harsh and bloody a business that it must be carried on harshly and bloodily, and as if those principles of conduct which are binding on us in the ordinary transactions of life had no application here. If that were so, war would be unlawful for the Christian, whose rule of life is inflexible, and who has been expressly told that not even his enemies are exempt from

that universal law of love which is the measure of his duty to God and man. It would be unlawful for him, and he would be bound to abstain from it at any cost of mortification, loss, or pain. But it is not so, and we ought to protest against the error with our whole soul and strength. War is indeed rough, stern work; he who engages in it must be prepared to do and witness, as well as to suffer, things shocking to the gentler feelings of man's nature; and it is possible for the conscience to be over-sensitive in this matter, as it may in any other which calls for the exercise of masculine firmness and resolution. But it confers no licence, as it involves no crime. The standard of right and wrong which we are bound to apply to it is the Christian standard, and no other. And many thousands of good and brave men have walked throughout their lives in that burning furnace of trial, unsullied and unhurt, on whom the smell of fire has not passed, and the flame has had no power, except to strengthen and refine their sense of duty and their trust in God. Rejecting and rebelling against every restriction which would really shackle the power to strike hard and strike home, it admits of being made more tolerable by humanity, by courtesy, and by the strict maintenance of established rules. And those who can thus mitigate its evils are responsible for doing so to the very utmost of their power. They will be told that they are depriving it of its legitimate terrors. That is the hacknied plea which has been alleged for every kind of cruelty which has ever been put on its defence—for cruel governments, cruel punishments, cruel laws. And the short answer to it is, that of the calamities which war inflicts, none are legitimate which can be averted by such means as these.

M. B.

ON THE RAPHAEL DRAWINGS IN THE UNIVERSITY GALLERIES, OXFORD.

AMONG the treasures which Oxford possesses, none are better deserving of attention than the drawings which are deposited in the University Galleries. They are well known to most amateurs and artists as having formed part of the collection of the late President of the Royal Academy, Sir Thomas Lawrence. To make a portion of those by Raphael more generally known to members of the University and strangers, and to show how the study of them will throw light upon the life of Raphael, and may be made conducive to a knowledge of the principles and practice of art, will be the object of the following essay.

A few words of preface relating to the previous history of the drawings will suffice. They were collected by Sir T. Lawrence, not only for his own study, but also with the intention of forwarding the cultivation of the fine arts in the kingdom, by their being ultimately placed in a locality where they should always be accessible to the public. With a view to this, a clause was inserted in his will, offering the entire collection of drawings to George IV., and to some distinguished patrons of the fine arts, as well as the Trustees of the British Museum, for 18,000*l.*, and if not purchased by either of these parties, then they were to be sold for 20,000*l.*—or about one-third of the original cost. A variety of circumstances prevented the purchase for a national object, and the collection was suffered to take its chance. It was purchased by Messrs. Woodburn, and after an exhibition which lasted ten days, on each of which one hundred select drawings of one or more different masters were exhibited, the collection was finally dispersed, not without fruitless attempts made by artists and amateurs to secure it from its impending fate.

The liberality of Sir T. Lawrence received abundant confirmation in the prices realized by a part of the drawings which were sold, and which passed out of the country to enrich

foreign collections. Fortunately for the interests of art in this country, a considerable portion of the Raphael and Michel Angelo drawings—from which the Prince of Orange had made selections amounting in value to 16,000*l.*—were kept together, and were offered to the University of Oxford for 7,000*l.* Of this a part was raised by subscription, and the remainder—upwards of 4,000*l.*—was munificently contributed by the Earl of Eldon, in 1846. A room was built for their reception by Mr. Cockerell, architect of the University Galleries, and the whole were exhibited with as little delay as possible for the purposes of observation and study. The greater part were placed on slanting desks, similar to those in the Gallery of the Louvre, provision being made for those cases where drawings were made on both sides of the paper by upright frames, so placed as to allow the drawings on both sides to be seen. (A similar arrangement has been adopted in the Wicar Gallery at Lille.)

The room in which they are placed is seventy feet long by twenty-eight feet broad, has a north aspect, and is lighted by side windows, so that the greater part of the drawings, of which all that are of any importance are framed and exposed to view, are very well seen. In addition to this long room, there is another adjoining, in which were recently exhibited specimens of a collection of drawings by the Caracci, presented to the University in 1853 by the Earl of Ellesmere, and which is occupied by pictures, bronzes, and other antiques, and select drawings and etchings, presented in 1855 by Mr. Chambers Hall, the greater part of whose valuable collection is kept in portfolios.

It is evident that, as the Oxford Collection increases, this mode of arrangement must be adopted to a greater extent. It admits of being applied, with great advantage, to a large collection of drawings, of which characteristic specimens may from time to time be exhibited, as is the case with the Dresden and Paris collections. A similar arrangement was in contemplation at the British Museum, till the necessity of providing room for the newly-arrived Nineveh marbles caused the trustees of the Museum to assign to that purpose the gallery which had been intended for the exhibition of drawings and engravings.

The number of drawings in the long room claiming to be by Raphael is one hundred and sixty-two. Of these thirty-eight, according to Passavant,* are spurious—being either copies

* In a MS. catalogue, very carefully drawn up, and most liberally entrusted by him to the author of this essay.

of Raphael's drawings, or original drawings of his pupils, Giulio Romano, and Giovanni Francesco Penni, or drawings of his school, the names of the authors being unknown. Among those which are unquestionably genuine, are specimens of Raphael's powers as a draughtsman, from the age of fifteen down to the year of his death. They may be said, therefore, to cover a period of about twenty-two years. Carefully examined, they will enable the student of art to arrive at a distinct conception of the development of Raphael's powers in one branch of his art, and that a very important one—namely, design. They will take us back to the period when he worked in the studio of Pietro Perugino, looking up with reverence and admiration to his master, and only dimly, and at times, conscious of a higher native inspiration. They will enable us to follow him once and again to Florence, and there to plunge with him into the circle of artists and literary men who then adorned the Tuscan capital. Lastly, they will carry us with Raphael to Rome, there to see realized the dreams of his early youth, and the studies of his opening manhood. We shall trace a constant progress in the artist, furnishing indications of a change in the habits and feelings of the man. We shall see a dreamy, tender sentimentalism pass into a well-defined, portrait-like rendering of nature, and this again expand itself into a freer, larger, more pictorial style, suited to the artist's mature years and ripened powers. We shall see his choice of subjects and his method of treatment corresponding to this change of sentiment and increase of power. First, the devotional subjects, and adherence to the conventional types of arrangement and treatment, which were handed down from the Byzantine school, but to which Raphael, even in the closest imitation, lent a grace peculiarly his own. Next, the domestic subjects of the Florentine school, which were treated by Raphael with all the feeling for beauty and individuality peculiar to the Umbrian school, combined with the correct drawing and feeling for nature which distinguished the Florentines. Lastly, his period of study ended, we trace the rapid unfolding of the artist's powers, stimulated to fresh exertions by the sight of the hitherto unrivalled works of L. da Vinci, and Michel Angelo, and choosing subjects from sacred and profane history, which enabled him to show his own fertility of conception and powers of execution.

In order that we may the more readily follow him through this career, a sketch of Raphael's artistic life, from his entering the school of Perugino to the time of his death, will be of some

use. It is chiefly drawn from Passavant's* well-known work, which is no less remarkable for the accuracy of its statements, and the minuteness of its researches, than for the soundness of its general conclusions. Rafaello (spelt also Raphaello, and, shortly, Rafael or Raphael,) Santi was born on Good Friday, 1483, at Urbino. So little is known of his childhood, that we need not consider his artistic life as beginning till the death of his father, Giovanni Santi, which took place August 1, 1494.

In looking out for a master for Raphael, his guardians had to choose between Andrea Mantegna, Francesco Francia in Bologna, Giovanni Bellini in Venice, Leonardo da Vinci in Milan, and Pietro Vannucci della Pieve, living at Perugia. To the latter he was consigned, probably in the year 1495. P. Perugino was then at the height of his reputation. He combined the advantages of careful study, love of his art, and a high sense of grace and beauty. His colouring was pure and rich, and his feeling for harmonious composition considerable. Owing to this combination of qualities, the paintings of Perugino were very highly esteemed; at a later period he and his pupils adopted a weaker and more insipid type, sacrificing strength and truth to sweetness and an affectation of devotion, and drawing down upon the school the rough, though not unjust, censure of Michel Angelo.

Perugino's studio was much frequented by young artists, of whom the principal were Andrea di Luigi of Assisi, called l'Ingegno, Bernardino di Betto of Perugia, and Pinturicchio. It is supposed by Rumohr,† that Raphael studied under l'Ingegno before he came to Perugino, but Passavant denies this. Of his connexion with Pinturicchio we have better evidence. He received assistance from Raphael in several of his works, the most important being the series of pictures in the library of the Cathedral at Sienna, representing the principal events in the life of Æneas Sylvius Piccolomini, afterwards Pope Pius II. These were painted by Pinturicchio—with alterations—from designs by Raphael, two of which are in the Oxford University Galleries (No. 122 and No. 7). The former of these is a study of four figures standing in different attitudes, in close-fitting buff under-suits, with apparently light cuirasses and armour. Three of them lean on halberts. There are several *pentimenti*. Indeed, Raphael seems to have let his hand play over the paper, till it was arrested by a striking attitude which he caught.

The earliest known picture by Raphael, is a copy of two

---

* *Rafael von Urbino, und sein Vater Giovanni Santi.*
† *Italienische Forschungen*, iii. 31.

children, by Perugino—the 'Infant Jesus and John the Baptist,' embracing. The original sketch by Perugino is in the Florentine Collection. Other studies of Raphael from works of Perugino are preserved in his sketch-book in the Academy at Venice, which contains above forty very interesting specimens of his early studies. He soon began to help his master in the execution of his works. The first picture in which he assisted Perugino was the 'Birth of Christ,' which is now preserved in the Vatican. The head of Joseph in this was painted by Raphael, whose study for it, a drawing in black chalk, is in the British Museum. He next helped his master in his picture of the 'Resurrection of Christ,' painted 1502, now in the Vatican. There were two of his studies for this in the Lawrence Collection. One of these is in the University Gallery (No. 111), representing two soldiers, one sitting on his shield and the other hurrying away. It may be asked—'How do we know the drawing to be Raphael's, and not Perugino's?' To this Passavant answers—'We know the figures to be Raphael's by the air of life which they exhibit, and by the refinement of expression. Moreover, the models are drawn in the clothes they wore, of which there is no instance in Perugino's case, who draped his models historically. Besides this, the drawing shows several marks of a young hand. For instance, there are several *pentimenti* in the standing figure, *v.g.* in the left leg and foot, and right arm.'

There is also an altar-piece, painted by Perugino for the Carthusian Monastery at Pavia, parts of which seem to indicate Raphael's hand. And it is proved that he worked at it by a drawing of his formerly in the Lawrence, now in the Oxford University Collection, of 'Tobias and the Angel' (No. 75). This can hardly have been executed before 1503,—so advanced is the style of drawing.

In 1502 Raphael painted an altar-piece for the Franciscan Church at Perugia, the subject of which was the 'Crowning of Mary.' In this picture, now in the Vatican, is a group of four angels playing on musical instruments. The Oxford University Collection possesses a study for two of these, No. 61, two young men drawn from the life in the close-fitting dress of the period. The one who stands facing us plays the violin, the other, who turns to the right, the tambourine. The outline of these figures is for the most part flowing and graceful. The right arm of the tambourine-player is, however, somewhat wooden. Raphael was evidently not satisfied with the hands, and has made two others, neither very well drawn.

Raphael's stay at Sienna, whither he went at Pinturicchio's request, was probably not long. Nevertheless, he remained

long enough to help his friend, of which we have already had evidence, and to make a drawing from an antique group of 'The Three Graces,' in the Library at Sienna, which is preserved in his sketch-book at Venice. A small picture painted afterwards from this is in Lord Ward's Collection.

During the latter part of his Perugian period—viz. from 1500 to 1504—Raphael went twice to Città di Castello, and executed several works there; the earliest of which, a 'Crucifixion,' formerly in Cardinal Fesch's Collection, is now in Lord Ward's Gallery, in London; the last, and most important, is the celebrated 'Marriage of the Virgin,' now in the Brera Gallery at Milan, in which Raphael, taking an earlier picture of his master for a model, added a grace and delicacy of expression that were peculiarly his own. The University Galleries possess, unfortunately, no studies for either of these pictures.

At the beginning of the year 1504, the Duke of Urbino, now restored to his country, received the appointment of Gonfaloniere of the Church of Rome. Raphael painted for him several small pictures, one of which, the 'St. George,' now in the Louvre, is remarkable for its accessories being taken from Dante's *Inferno*, cantos viii. and xxiii.-xxiv. Raphael did not long remain at his native place. At this time the fame of Leonardo da Vinci's works had reached Urbino, and raised in the youthful painter a desire to visit Florence. He procured a letter of introduction from Joanna, Duchess of Sora, to Pietro Soderini, the Gonfaloniere, which is now extant, and bears the date Oct. 1, 1504. The Duchess speaks of Raphael's father with regard, and of himself with almost maternal affection, giving a notion of her kindly disposition, and the high estimation in which artists were held at the Court of Urbino.

On his arrival at Florence, he made acquaintance with the earlier works of Florentine painters, and also those of living artists, especially of Leonardo da Vinci, whose celebrated cartoon, representing a victory gained by the Florentines over the Milanese at the battle of Anghiari, was just exhibited. Of the earlier men he chiefly studied Masaccio, who introduced a new era in the art, by breaking loose from the servile imitation of Giotto, and adopting a grander style of composition, which combined truth of nature with breadth of light and shade. Several traces of the study of Masaccio remain in Raphael's works, as in the well-known figure of 'St. Paul preaching at Athens;' but there are no very marked instances in the University Galleries. We have traces of his imitation of L. da Vinci, both in drawings and pictures which exist. Of the former, one of the most interesting is a study of heads, closely resembling some of Leonardo's,

and a very slight sketch of the principal group of horsemen in the 'Battle of the Standard' (No. 44, Oxford Collection). The head in profile is said to be a likeness of Fra Bartolommeo. If so, it was taken by Raphael when his friend was criticising some work of art or listening to some discourse. The protruded lower lip gives an air of great individuality to the head. Vasari describes Raphael as having been greatly struck by the grandeur of Leonardo's style, which we can well imagine. Bottari tries to show that they were great friends, and that a crayon portrait of Raphael, at the age of twenty, formerly belonging to General Guise, and now in Christchurch Library, Oxford, was by Leonardo. Of this there is no probability whatever. Indeed, the execution shows it, says Passavant, to have been done by a young and feeble hand.

In 1505, Raphael received a commission to paint a side-chapel of the Church of St. Severo in Perugia, in fresco. This is the first fresco-painting which he is known to have executed. It represented the Holy Trinity surrounded by six Camaldolese monks. In arrangement it resembled some pictures of Angelico da Fiesole and Fra Bartolommeo; and the same idea was further carried out by Raphael, in 1509, in the 'Disputa.' It was long preserved in Perugia, and is now in the King of Bavaria's possession. The monks are very noble; the angels somewhat affected; but the whole picture and its composition show a marked progress, whether attributable to the influence of Masaccio or to the nature of fresco-painting. A study for one of the heads—St. Benedict—is in the Oxford Collection, on the same sheet as the sketch of the 'Battle of the Standard,' from L. da Vinci's cartoon (No. 44). The same year he also engaged to paint an 'Assumption of the Virgin' in the Convent of Monte Luca, at Perugia; but he never executed it, though he received thirty ducats in advance. In short, nothing at this time could keep Raphael from Florence. At Perugia he only got employment. What he wanted was instruction, and to Florence he went, where, of all places, he could best obtain it. In the winter of 1505 we hear of Raphael frequenting the studio of Baccio d'Agnolo, architect and sculptor, where conversazioni of artists and amateurs were held. Vasari gives a list of the artists who assembled there constantly, including Michel Angelo. Here Raphael made many acquaintances, which led to his being further employed. He painted for Lorenzo Nasi the 'Madonna with the Goldfinch' (del Cardellino), now in the Tribune at Florence. A study for this picture is in the Oxford Collection (No. 120) It is a very beautiful pen sketch, representing the Virgin, the

Infant Saviour, and St. John. Reference will be made to this drawing afterwards, as illustrating Raphael's method of study. For Taddeo Taddei he painted, in 1506, out of friendship and gratitude for his kindness and hospitality, two Madonnas —one, the 'Madonna in Green,' at Vienna, in the Belvedere Gallery; the other, probably, the round picture, once in the Orleans, now in the Bridgewater Gallery, with a palm-branch. The first is remarkable, as showing a direct imitation of L. da Vinci in the brown foreground and character of the drawing. There is a study for this picture in the University Galleries (No. 19), consisting of the Virgin, the Infant Saviour, and St. John, whose figure is slightly indicated. The second is more truly Raphaelesque. The portraits of Angelo Doni and Maddalena Strozzi, his wife, painted the same year, now in the Pitti Palace, are very much in the manner of Leonardo.

What would have been the effect on Raphael's mind and style of painting had he remained a longer time under the influence of Leonardo is not an uninteresting question. Nay, we may carry it back to his early training, and ask—'What would Raphael have been had he been brought up in the school of L. da Vinci instead of that of Pietro Perugino?' Let us transport ourselves to the great room at the Louvre, where we have specimens of Raphael's early Florentine, or Peruginesque manner; of his later Florentine, and of his Roman manner; and where we have also two noble specimens of Leonardo's easel pictures. Now, if we take the quality of *expression*—meaning thereby the thought and sentiment conveyed by the human countenance, and, in a less degree, by the attitude — Raphael's pictures stand the comparison with Leonardo's very differently. The earlier ones—the 'St. George' and the picture called 'La Belle Jardinière'—are thrown somewhat in the shade; but there is a chivalrous determination in the attitude of the warrior saint that shows thought and purpose in the artist; and the exquisite purity of the Virgin's expression, the charm of her oval face, and downcast eyes, are things *sui generis*—very delightful to the feelings, if not suggestive of deep thought. But the great 'Holy Family' and the 'St. Michael' are positively killed by Leonardo's proximity. They may have possessed a more spiritual character when Francis I. first received them; but as they are now seen, they wax pale—as regards the quality of expression—before the 'Santa Anna' and the portrait of 'Mona Lisa.' The comparison of Leonardo's (or his pupil's) 'La Vierge aux Rochers' with Raphael's 'Ste. Marguerite,' in the Long Gallery, is equally unfavourable to Raphael's pretensions to the character of a thoughtful painter. It may, of course, be said that Raphael's fame does

not rest on his oil pictures, but on his frescoes, and his cartoons for the tapestries. Neither does Leonardo's rest on his easel pictures, but on his cartoon of the 'Battle of Anghiari' and his 'Last Supper.' Putting these facts together, and speculating thereon, it does appear more than probable that Raphael, had he studied under L. da Vinci instead of Pietro Perugino, would have learned to pourtray qualities of mind which only now and then find in him a ready and congenial exponent. And he would, doubtless, have acquired a greater insight into the structure of the human frame, and more unerring accuracy in drawing the extremities.

It will perhaps strike the reader that the comparison of Leonardo's serious pictures with Raphael's later works, in which he did not aim at representing intensity of thought and sentiment, is unfair. Doubtless, there is more similarity between Raphael's 'Sposalizio' and his 'Madonna del Granduca' and Leonardo's 'Vierge aux Rochers' and 'Santa Anna' than between any of Raphael's Louvre pictures and Leonardo's. It may be said, further, that where there is no identity of aim between two painters, there can be no comparison between their works. Granted. But let us compare their respective aims. If we find one painter aiming at the representation of deep thought and sentiment, and the other at that of a greater variety of emotion; the one choosing types of countenance and attitudes which harmonize with a profound, tranquil, meditative spirit, and the other delighting in the various expressions which mark the differences of age and sex, and the easy and delicate play of graceful lines which diffuses a joyous cheerfulness over the picture; we are surely at liberty to say which we prefer, and which aim we think the nobler. Moreover, when the latter painter has changed his aim,—when we find that, at an earlier period, he placed before his mind a different object as attainable by his art, we may surely compare the purpose of his youth with that of his later years; and if the latter appear to us less noble, we may express a feeling of regret that he had not that inducement to persevere in his early motives which the example of Leonardo would have given him.

Early in 1506 Raphael went to Bologna, partly to see Francesco Francia, and partly in consequence of an invitation from Giovanni Bentivoglio, Lord of Bologna. Few particulars are known of this visit; Vasari does not mention it; but we know it must have been early in the year, as Giovanni Bentivoglio was driven out by the Pope in the autumn of 1506, and we know that Raphael painted a 'Nativity' for him.

After finishing his work in Bologna, Raphael visited Urbino

for the third time. He found the Court there in greater splendour than before, owing to the Duke's having recovered some of his father's lost property, among which were some antique bronzes and other works of art. It was frequented by some of the choicest spirits of the age, like the court at Weimar in the days of Herder, Goethe, and Schiller. The Duke was a man of varied accomplishments, of considerable learning, and distinguished by his courtesy and amenity. The Duchess, Elizabeth Gonzaga, was also remarkable for the charms of her person and the graces of her mind. Jacobo Sadoleto and Pietro Bembo have left us descriptions of the general tone of the Court of Urbino; but Count Castiglione, in his *Libro del Cortigiano*, has left the fullest and most detailed account. He has also preserved a specimen of the kind of evening entertainments in which the ducal court delighted—viz. *A Discourse on Love and Beauty*, by Pietro Bembo. Whether Raphael took part in these entertainments does not appear, but he was well known to most of the distinguished persons at court; and the cultivation of mind and manners which prevailed there exercised, doubtless, an important, though, as some think, not an entirely healthy influence over him.

The Duke's means, never large, did not allow of his employing Raphael in any very important works. He painted, however, for him a second small picture of 'St. George,' wearing under his right knee the order of the Garter, of which Henry VII. had made the Duke a knight. With this and other presents Count Castiglione left Urbino, July 10th, 1506, and arrived at Dover, October 20th. He was received by the King with great pomp, and acting as the Duke's proxy, was invested with the Order, and visited all the Knights of the Garter. The picture of 'St. George,' then presented to Henry VII., found its way, after various changes of owners, to St. Petersburg, where it is now kept, with an ever-burning lamp before it, in the Hermitage. There is a carefully finished study for this picture in the University Collection (No. 21), representing St. George on horseback, taking a spring to the left, and raising his right arm to give a deadly thrust at the dragon. It was about this time that Raphael painted the small picture of the 'Three Graces,' before mentioned. It is remarkable, says Passavant, as being the first picture in imitation of the antique which Raphael is known to have painted, and also, because it was to the culture of those three graces that Raphael, more than any other Christian painter, devoted himself.

Whether Raphael stayed at Urbino till the arrival of Pope Julius II. is not known. He arrived on September 26th,

1506, and stayed three days; during which, even if Raphael was not personally introduced to him, the Pope could hardly fail to become acquainted with his works. Be that as it may, Raphael returned to Florence to prosecute his studies. Here he found Michel Angelo's famous cartoon of the 'Battle of Pisa' just exhibited. It was the theme of universal admiration, in which Raphael doubtless joined; but we do not at this period perceive in his works any traces of Michel Angelo's influence. It is not improbable, as Passavant surmises, that he was displeased at the contemptuous way in which Michel Angelo spoke of his master, Perugino, and his friend Francia; but he was also under the influence of other artists at the time, and it is likely that he found their style and manner of execution more in harmony with the works in which he was then engaged. During this, his last residence at Florence, Raphael received a commission to paint an 'Entombment' for the Franciscan Church at Perugia. He bestowed greater pains on the studies that he made preparatory to his execution of this cartoon than he had hitherto done for any work. Four studies for it are in England; two from the Crozat Collection, known by Count Caylus's copperplate engravings; one was erroneously called the 'Death of Adonis,' from the figures being undraped. This is in the Oxford Collection, on the reverse of a drawing marked No. 131. Other studies for the same picture will be described hereafter. It may suffice for the present to point out a circumstance, noticed by Passavant and Waagen, that in two of these drawings Raphael has imitated a design for the same subject by Andrea Mantegna, from which a study is preserved in Raphael's sketch-book at Venice. This shows that he was not averse to taking existing types as the groundwork of his compositions; at the same time that he carried out the idea after his own imagination, adding to the stiff and severe outlines of earlier masters a peculiar grace and beauty.

After finishing these studies at Florence, he returned to Perugia, and completed his picture, which bears Raphael's name, and the date 1507. It drew down the admiration of all artists; Vasari calls it a divine work. It is now in the Borghese Palace, Rome. Raphael painted two accompanying pictures to it, after which he went back to Florence, where he probably painted the 'St. Catherine of Alexandria,' once Mr. Beckford's, now in the National Gallery. This picture does not show the same careful finish as the 'Entombment,' but is executed with a freedom no less charming. The Oxford Collection possesses a very fine study, drawn with the pen, for the forepart of the head of the saint. In point of expression, this

sketch surpasses the picture. On the same sheet (No. 152) are designs for five boy angels of exquisite grace, and, on the reverse, three studies for the picture of 'St. Catherine' of less importance.

In the last year of his residence at Florence, Raphael painted 'La Belle Jardinière,' which is probably the picture of which Vasari speaks as having been left by Raphael to be finished by D. Ghirlandajo. The drawing of this picture is careful, and shows Raphael's predilection for full, rounded forms. He did not think it necessary at this period to draw an angel down from the skies, nor to exalt a mortal to them; but he found in the representation of pure, contemplative, maternal love, and the adoration of the infant John Baptist, an expression of his devotion for the child Jesus. One of the drawings lately given by Mr. Chambers Hall to the Oxford Gallery is a careful pen study for the 'St. John.'

Thus Raphael employed his pencil alternately in carefully studied, and lightly executed, pictures; both of them being equally conducive to his improvement in the technical part of his art.

During his last stay at Florence he made the acquaintance of Fra Bartolommeo; and from him learned an improved method of laying on his colours, a broader disposition of his draperies, and a more natural flesh-tone. In return, Raphael is said to have instructed him in perspective, which he had learned under Perugino. They became great friends, and the influence the Frate had on Raphael, is shown by the 'Madonna del Baldachino,' now in the Pitti Palace. It was never finished; but it would be taken at first sight for Fra Bartolommeo's work. Raphael also helped the Frate in many pictures, especially one of 'St. Peter' at Rome.

Always ready to assist his friends, he sent at this time a careful study for a 'Holy Family' to his friend Domenico di Paris Alfani, who had to paint an altar-piece for the Carmelite Church at Perugia. This drawing, with Raphael's autograph letter at the back, is preserved in the Wicar Collection at Lille, with the date 1508.

In April, 1508, Giudubaldo I., Duke of Urbino, died. Shortly after, Raphael wrote a letter from Florence to his uncle at Urbino, in which he talked of visiting his native town after Easter. This he never accomplished. In the midst of his engagements he was called away by a summons from Pope Julius II. to decorate the interior of the Vatican, a command which he gladly obeyed, leaving several pictures behind him unfinished, and with directions to D. Ghirlandajo to finish them. In the summer of 1508 he entered Rome,

the future scene of his artistic labours, as the chosen painter, destined, under two successive pontiffs, to decorate the Eternal City with works of deathless fame.

Julius II., on his return to Rome, began to carry into execution plans for the embellishment of the city of the Cæsars, now the centre of spiritual power. The most celebrated artists were summoned to Rome for that purpose. The building of the Church of St. Peter on the site of the old Basilica, the painting of the ceiling of a chapel raised by his uncle, Sixtus IV., and the decoration of the interior of the Vatican, were entrusted to Bramante, Michel Angelo, and Raphael respectively. The walls of the chambers in the Vatican were already covered with paintings executed partly under the Popes Nicholas V. and Sixtus IV., and partly under Alexander VI., whose memory Julius II. wished to efface.

Raphael began with the Camera della Segnatura, which may be called 'The Chamber of the Four Faculties.' In the four compartments devoted respectively to Theology, Philosophy, Poetry, and Jurisprudence, Raphael represented the range of human science and knowledge manifested in four principal directions. Whether he was led to the choice of these subjects by the advice of the Pope, or by that of his learned friends, does not appear. It is more likely that his own perceptions of what was suitable guided him mainly in the task. That he also consulted his friends is, however, clear, from a letter addressed by him to the poet Ariosto on the subject of the characters to be introduced in his 'Theology,' preserved in Richardson's *Traité de la Peinture*, p. 333. It is not unlikely that a sheet of paper (No. 162, Oxford Collection), on which is a study for a 'Holy Family,' and some writing by Raphael—'Carissimo quanto fratelo,' &c.—is an unfinished commencement of this letter.

The Pope was so delighted with the first specimen of Raphael's powers—the 'Theology,' commonly called after a misnomer of Vasari's 'La Disputa del Sacramento'—that he ordered the other fresco paintings in the Vatican to be destroyed, including those on the roof of the Camera della Segnatura. Of this order Raphael availed himself only partially, clearing the four large circular spaces in the dome, and the oblong spaces in the corners of the ceiling. On the circular spaces he painted four allegorical figures, the first being 'Theology,' under which is the fresco representing the 'Agreement of Heaven and Earth in the Scheme of Man's Redemption.' In the upper part is represented the Glory of Heaven, with the Almighty Father, surrounded by angels, beneath whom are the Saviour with the Virgin Mary and John the

Baptist on either hand, and on each side are founders of orders, saints, and witnesses to the truth of Christ in the Old and New Testament: in the lower, the most learned and pious theologians unite in the celebration of the Lord's Supper. The person of our Saviour forms the centre of the upper part, as the Holy Sacrament does that of the lower. A minute description of the figures would here be out of place, but it may interest the reader to observe that Dante finds his place among the theologians, and that in this Raphael had been preceded by Benozzo Gozzoli, who styled the author of the *Divina Commedia* 'Theologus Dantes, nullius dogmatis expers.' There are several studies for this picture in the Oxford Collection. Of these No. 85 is a slight but very masterly drawing, in bistre, of thirteen figures for the upper part of the composition. 'It is the more interesting,' says Waagen, 'as some of the motives, as, for instance, the figure of the Saviour (who is represented with a book unrolled on his left knee), differ from the fresco picture, and yet are not less beautiful.' The figure of the Virgin is very striking. She is not the 'Regina cœli,' but 'the handmaid of the Lord,' whose clasped hands, and head bowed towards the Saviour, express the lowliest adoration. The only fault to be observed in this fine drawing is the apparent want of unity and connexion between the figures. This may be partly owing to the clouds, which support them, being nearly obliterated. No. 102 is a study for 'The Apostle Paul;' beneath him, on the right, is a boy angel bearing him up. Finely drawn in black chalk in the manner of Fra Bartolommeo. No. 96 is a study of five angels for the same composition. Perhaps the most interesting drawing of all is that marked No. 9, on which are several studies of heads, namely, two of the three youths watching, two bishops' heads, and a hand. Waagen says, 'this drawing interested me much, for the slight but feeling sketch of the graceful figure of the kneeling youth. We here see the first realization of the form as it arose in Raphael's mind. This and No. 8 formerly made one sheet, and contained, besides the designs, rough copies of two sonnets by Raphael's hand.' One of these, which begins 'Amor tu men vescati,' is given afterwards, p. 184.

In the oblong spaces, of which Raphael availed himself to paint introductory pictures, leading from one subject to another, he represented on each side of 'Theology,' leading to 'Jurisprudence' and 'Poetry,' the 'Fall of Adam,' and the 'Judgment of Marsyas.' The double relation of the latter is not so obvious, but Raphael was perhaps led by Dante's example (see

Paradiso, canto i., v. 20,) to regard the flaying of Marsyas as a theological symbol. It represents more obviously, in a mythological form, the triumph of divinely inspired, over earthly, sensual poetry. Raphael represented Poetry by an allegorical figure on the roof, and a mythological composition consisting of Apollo and the nine Muses, and the greatest ancient and modern poets standing or reposing under lofty laurel-trees, on the summit and sides of a hill representing Parnassus. The figure of Poetry is one of the finest ever conceived, fully answering to the claim of inspiration which the motto 'Numine afflatur' asserts. The wall-picture, though good in arrangement, is unequal in execution. The Oxford Collection possesses two studies for this picture. No. 59, a slight pen-and-ink sketch, apparently a first design for the entire composition. The figures are all nude, and for the most part well drawn. The other, No. 155, is a pen drawing of great feeling, representing Melpomene holding a mask before her, and has the appearance of a study from the antique. Beneath the Parnassus are two small historical subjects,—Alexander laying Homer's poems in the tomb of Achilles, and Augustus preventing Plautius Tucca and Varius from burning the Æneis.

In the round space above the next wall is the allegorical figure of Philosophy, with the motto 'Causarum cognitio.' The great fresco underneath is called the 'School of Athens,' because Athens was the fountain-head from which the streams of Philosophy issued forth over the Western world. Greek philosophy was, at the beginning of the sixteenth century, attracting an ever-increasing number of votaries, and the *Lives of the Philosophers*, by Diogenes Laertius, was much read. It was from this source, probably, that Raphael was led to the selection of the representatives of the different schools. A detailed description of this great picture is given in Passavant, vol. i. pp. 148-160; also in Kugler, pp. 347-8. There are no less than five studies for the 'School of Athens' in the Oxford Collection, viz. No. 93, a study for the two figures on the steps, near Diogenes, beautifully drawn with a fine metal point. The attitudes of the figures and the arrangement of the draperies are singularly graceful. Raphael evidently felt a difficulty in the hand turned back, of which, and of the head with flowing curls, there are separate studies. Beside this is a study for Medusa's head on the shield of Minerva. It has snaky hair and an open mouth, but is simply a human being 'making a face,' with none of the ideal character of Michel Angelo's 'Medusa.' No. 105, a study for the group of 'Archimedes,' represented by Bramante, with his four pupils about him, and with the crowned figure. The

head of Bramante, almost seen from the top of the skull, is drawn again on the right, from life; a very interesting drawing, also with the silver point. The three remaining studies are for accessory parts of the same picture, viz. No. 31, a design for the architectural background on the left, with the statue of Apollo in the niche,—No. 49, a study for the bas-relief under the statue of Apollo—four naked warriors in animated combat, with a fifth indicated, drawn with great spirit and life from the model in red chalk, and somewhat differing from the completion of the design in fresco,—and No. 50, the architectural background on the right, with the statue of Minerva, and also three others in the side niches—a very masterly drawing with the silver point, finished with the same care as No. 93. Raphael used a peculiar kind of rosy-tinted paper for three of these sketches. Another—a study for 'Diogenes'—on the same paper, is exhibited in the Städel Museum at Frankfurt-on-Main. Pity that it was ever parted from its congeners! The same remark applies in a higher sense to a study from the nude of seventeen figures for the lower part of the 'Disputa,' which formerly belonged to Timoteo della Vite, and is now in the Frankfurt Museum. The Oxford Collection does not possess so fine a specimen of Raphael's studies from the life. No one should pass through Frankfurt without asking to see it.

The transition picture to the 'Jurisprudence' is 'The Judgment of Solomon.' Above the large picture is a symbolical figure of Justice. The great wall-picture is divided into three compartments. Above, in the lunette, are three allegorical figures of Strength, Prudence, and Temperance. These, with the symbolical figure above, represent the four cardinal virtues. The subjects in the lower part of the fresco represent the establishment of Law and Justice under the Roman emperors and the popes. On one side Tribonianus delivers the *Pandects* to Justinian; on the other, Gregory IX. (represented by Julius II.), accompanied by two cardinals (Giovanni de' Medici and Antonio del Monte), hands the *Decretals*, drawn up by Raimondi Pennaforti, to a consistorial advocate. Between this and the 'Theology' is 'The Fall of Adam,' the cause of the necessity of all human laws.

Thus Raphael finished the Camera della Segnatura. In the introductory, or transition pictures, a considerable difference in point of execution is observable. Hence we may fairly assume that Raphael had already begun to employ his pupils to assist in the execution of his works. The earliest of these frescoes—the 'Theology'—shows a transition from the Florentine school of the fifteenth century to the later Florentine school of the beginning of the sixteenth. It is very carefully

painted; yet shows, says Passavant, an incomplete knowledge of the art,—the lower part exhibiting, in this respect, a marked advance on the upper. The 'Parnassus' is probably the next in order. In careful execution it is inferior to the 'Theology;' but the arrangement of light and shade, the masses of colour, &c., are broad and grand, the forms noble and graceful, with the exception of that of Apollo, which is neither, and which was probably a portrait of a renowned improvisatore, Jacopo Sansecondo. The 'School of Athens' first exhibits a complete mastery over the treatment of the subject, and the technical portion of the painter's art. In the historical association of characters he was assisted by his friend, Count Baldassare Castiglione. The credit of representing the successive development of the different schools of philosophy by a series of historical portraits is his own. His treatment of ancient costumes is also remarkable. At that time comparatively few antique sculptures and paintings had been discovered; yet no one has ever surpassed Raphael in representing antique drapery. Altogether, the picture may be regarded, says Passavant, as the greatest work of Raphael,—that in which the severity of the old masters was most successfully tempered by, and blended with, the freedom and breadth of the new, and in which adequate conceptions of a noble subject were most nobly carried out by masterly handling. This is the first picture in which Raphael attained to the great pictorial style at which the masters of the early part of the sixteenth century aimed. L. da Vinci and Giorgione possessed the art of pictorial treatment of subjects in a very high degree; but both of them were surpassed by Raphael. He was more of a painter than any one else, if a combination of the greatest mental and mechanical gifts peculiar to the art deserve that title.

Michel Angelo was not contented with pictorial treatment in painting. He even introduced it into sculpture; and his three greatest compositions—the 'Cartoon of Pisa,' the ceiling of the Sistine Chapel, and 'The Last Judgment'—show a progressive development of this quality. That he should have exercised an influence over Raphael, is natural; but it was not to that extent which Vasari asserts, inasmuch as some of Raphael's chief excellences were wholly independent of Michel Angelo. It first appears, slightly, in the 'School of Athens;' more markedly in the 'Jurisprudence.' This was not before the end of 1512 or beginning of 1513; for Michel Angelo had not removed the scaffolding on Christmas Day, 1512. The first sight of half the ceiling which Raphael enjoyed, opened, we are told, a more exalted view of the end of art to him. He seems to have made studies from Michel Angelo's frescoes, as,

v.g. one which is at Holkham, representing 'The Brazen Serpent,' and one, formerly in the Lawrence Collection, of 'Adam and Eve driven out of Paradise.' In the 'School of Athens,' the statue of Apollo bears a strong resemblance to Michel Angelo's 'Slave,' left unfinished by him as part of the monument of Julius II. Raphael's imitation of Michel Angelo is still more apparent in the three figures of the Virtues in the compartment of 'Jurisprudence.' Whilst he was engaged in painting the Camera della Segnatura, Raphael became acquainted with 'The Fornarina'—so called by later Italian writers—and his love for her, which was continued till the day of his death, is expressed in three sonnets, one of which is in the British Museum; the two others have been already spoken of as being in the Oxford Collection. They are all three written on sheets of paper containing sketches for the 'Theology,' showing how strangely Raphael blended together things divine and human.

Soon after Raphael's arrival at Rome, in 1508, he wrote a letter (dated Sept. 5) to Francesco Francia, at Bologna, who had sent him his portrait, promising to send him his own in return, and speaking of his assistants, of whom, at this time, doubtless Giovanni Fr. Penni, of Florence, was one. This is probably the portrait which Paul Pontius engraved on copper. During his early Roman period, Raphael painted a considerable number of easel pictures, to gratify his private friends and patrons. They were chiefly portraits and Madonnas, the latter of which, differing greatly in their motives, show Raphael's felicity in representing the pure sentiment of maternal love.

In 1512, he painted, in fresco, by the order of Janus Corizius, a figure of the prophet Isaiah, in the Church of St. Agostino. Vasari says that he destroyed his first fresco, on seeing Michel Angelo's ceiling of the Sistine Chapel, and executed the figure of the prophet in a bolder and grander style. This cannot be the case if Passavant's date, given above, be correct: but, even if we assume it to be true, the figure of Isaiah is, on the whole, one of the least excellent of Raphael's compositions. It no doubt appears more Michel Angelesque than it was originally, owing to the fact that it was restored by Daniele di Volaterra, in the time of Pope Paul IV. On the whole, it is very questionable whether Raphael derived much good from Michel Angelo. Their excellences were of very different kinds, and Raphael is never so successful as when he is most himself. Vasari, indeed, says as much towards the close of his *Life of Raphael*, where he observes—

That every man should content himself with performing such

works as he may reasonably be supposed to be capable of and equal to, by his inclination and the gifts bestowed on him by nature, without seeking to contend for that which she has not qualified him to attain; and this let him do, that he may not uselessly spend his time, fatiguing himself vainly, nay, not unfrequently, to his own injury as well as discredit.

Michel Angelo himself (on the authority of Condivi) said of Raphael, that he had attained to excellence less by natural talent than by long study; and in a letter (published by Sebastiano Ciampi) he said, 'whatever Raphael knew of art, he knew from me.' These sayings, even if truly attributed to Michel Angelo, must be taken less as his definite opinion, than as an expression of his irritable and quarrelsome temper, instances of which are attested and given by Passavant (vol. i. pp. 182, 183). Raphael spoke in handsomer terms of his great rival, saying (according to Condivi) that 'he thanked God he was born in the time of Michel Angelo, for he had learned from him a different art to that of any other painter.'

From the Camera della Segnatura, Raphael passed on to the Stanza of Heliodorus. Here spaces were cleared, as in the former instance, and subjects introduced, representing the revelations made by God to the patriarchs, and the instances of miraculous protection afforded to the Christian Church. The first of these is variously entitled, 'The Call of Abraham,' and 'God blessing the Offspring of Noah.' Passavant inclines to the latter designation. It is one of Raphael's finest compositions. The second, 'The Offering of Abraham,' is inferior. The third, 'Jacob's Dream,' is a still greater falling off. The same subject was afterwards treated much better by Raphael, in a sketch for the Loggie of the Vatican, formerly in the Lawrence Collection. The fourth, 'God appearing to Moses in the Burning Bush,' is grand in composition, and possesses a force like that of Michel Angelo. The original sketch of this is in the Oxford Collection (No. 5). The Almighty is represented surrounded by angels and enveloped in flames. 'This study, which is executed with extraordinary fire, shows, by its treatment and handling,' says Passavant, 'the influence which Michel Angelo's frescoes in the Sistine Chapel had begun to exercise upon Raphael.' Grand as it unquestionably is, it does not convey the idea of the Almighty at rest encircled by flames. It rather looks like an illustration of the passage in the Psalms, rendered in our metrical version—

> And on the wings of mighty winds
> Came flying all abroad.

In executing these works, Raphael made a discovery that the

plaster was ill suited for fresco painting,—fortunately in time to save the principal pictures from the fate of the foregoing,—viz., the fading of the colour. The first great subject was Heliodorus, the collector of King Seleucus' revenue, driven out of the Temple at Jerusalem by an interposition of Heaven, as described 2 Maccabees iii. (For a detailed account see Passavant, vol. i. pp. 194, 195; Kugler, b. v. iv. 2. pp. 352, 353.) The colouring of this fine picture shows an attempt, on the part of Raphael, to introduce Giorgione's rich, deep colouring into fresco painting. The drawing is less careful in particulars than in the earlier frescoes; but the forms are grander, the masses of light and shade broader, and the whole composition more in the great pictorial style. Raphael's dramatic power shows itself forcibly in the group of Heliodorus, and illustrates the remark of Schelling,—

> As moral virtue does not consist in the absence, but in the mastery of passion, so the merit of art does not consist in the avoiding of strong emotion, but in maintaining the supremacy of beauty over it.

There is a fine study in the Oxford Collection, for the back of the kneeling female figure (No. 160), which is particularly interesting, not only on account of the air of life which it wears, but because, as Waagen says,—

> It shows, from various accidents in the drapery, afterwards suppressed in the picture, that Raphael, in drawing from the life, adhered faithfully to his model in every respect, and reserved the simplification and idealising of the subject for the picture.

There is also a grand fragment of the cartoon,—viz. the horse's head in the same picture (No. 133).

In the next picture, 'The Mass of Bolsena,' the innate power of the Church is shown in the representation of a miracle said to have taken place in 1263. A priest, who doubted the doctrine of transubstantiation, was convinced by the blood which, it is said, flowed from the host he was consecrating. (For details, see Passavant, vol. i. pp. 196-198; Kugler, pp. 353, 354.) The colouring of this picture is very fine. It possesses nearly all the qualities of oils. Passavant does not hesitate to give it a preference to Titian's famous 'School of St. Antonio,' at Padua, and Kugler agrees with him in this verdict. In both of these the portrait of Pope Julius II. was introduced. There is a first design for this picture in the University Galleries (No. 26). It is drawn with the pen, slightly shaded with sepia, and touched with white. It differs from the finished composition. The Pope kneels on the left; the figures of the foreground are quite differently

grouped, and the Swiss guards, or throne-bearers, are wanting. There are two other drawings of this subject, viz. No. 42, a copy of the above original, and No. 125, a small drawing after the fresco; both quite unworthy, says Passavant, of the place which they occupy.

At this point in the execution of his great works in the Vatican, Raphael lost his patron. The two remaining frescoes which he executed in the same chamber were carried out under Leo X. The subjects were chosen with reference to recent events in the life of the Pope,—viz. the invasion and retreat of Attila, alluding, probably, to the expulsion of the French from Italy, which Leo X. had effected, by the assistance of the Swiss, in 1513; and 'The Deliverance of Peter from Prison,' chosen, perhaps, to signify the deliverance of Giov. de' Medici (Leo X.) from prison, after the battle of Ravenna, described in Passavant, i. 199—201; Kugler, p. 355.

The Oxford Collection possesses a first design for 'The Invasion of Attila' (No. 132), drawn with the pen, and faintly shaded in sepia. On the left, Pope Leo I. is borne on a chair. In front are two kneeling men. On the right is Attila, on horseback, attended by mounted men-at-arms, one of whom bears the standard. The execution of this drawing, so far as it goes, is very careful; and the dramatic effect produced by the contrast of the warlike invader and the peaceful defender remarkably striking.

Before proceeding to speak of Raphael's later works, a brief comparison between the paintings in the first and second Stanze may be serviceable. Those in the second show an advance in the technical part of the art. The figures are larger and better proportioned to the size of the frescoes; they are grouped more in masses; there is more of dramatic force and energy of action; the colouring is richer and more life-like, and laid on in a more masterly way. But those in the first, especially the 'Theology,' exhibit more elevation of thought. The drawing is more severe, and the character of the heads nobler. Thus, the frescoes in the second stanza strike more at first sight, and impress us more with a sense of the *artist's* power. Those in the first produce a more lasting effect on the mind, and fill us with an elevated idea of the *man* who conceived works of such deep meaning and solemn interest.

About this time Agostino Chigi, a wealthy man, and a great patron of art, gave Raphael orders to decorate two chapels—one in the Church of Santa Maria della Pace, the other in that of Santa Maria del Popolo—both of which had been built by the Pope's uncle, and were favourite churches of his.

In Santa Maria del Popolo, A. Chigi commissioned Raphael to build him a chapel which, however, neither of them lived to see executed. In Santa Maria della Pace, Raphael executed on the wall above the arches four prophets, and the same number of angels; and beneath, four sibyls—the Cumaean, Persian, Phrygian, and Tiburtine. These are surpassed in majesty and grandeur by Michel Angelo's, at the same time that they excelled his in grace. The prophets are inferior, and can hardly have been painted by Raphael, though the drawings may have been his. Passavant thinks it probable that the execution was by the hand of Timoteo della Vite. Three studies for these frescoes exist in the Oxford Collection: No. 46, a study for the youthful 'Phrygian Sibyl' in the Chiesa della Pace, executed in red chalk—'of marvellous depth of feeling in the head,' says Waagen, 'and as spirited as it is softly and broadly treated.' The fling of the left arm over the right shoulder is very grand, and the attitude of the whole figure full of grace. The expression of the mouth is, however, serious, not to say sullen: No. 11, a study in red chalk for the figure of 'The Almighty,' in the cupola of the Church of St[a] Maria del Popolo, in the grand style of Michel Angelo; and No. 84, a study of the same kind for 'an Angel' lifting up both hands, in the cupola of the same church.

The great works in the Stanze were interrupted soon after the death of Julius II. by the appointment of Raphael to the office of architect of St. Peter's. His pencil was not idle, however. One of his most beautiful frescoes, the 'Galatea,' was painted by him for Agostino Chigi in 'The Farnesina', in 1514. It is particularly interesting, as there is a letter of Raphael's to Count Castiglione respecting it, and acknowledging that, finding no models sufficiently beautiful, he 'availed himself of a certain ideal of beauty which hovered before him.' The same letter contains an intimation of the new burden laid upon his shoulders by his appointment in place of Bramante. The following year the Pope made Raphael superintendent of all antique marbles, inscriptions, &c., with leave to employ any for the Vatican, and power to inflict a fine on any persons wilfully damaging them, or failing to give notice of their discovery. He was now engaged in three different capacities, each of them furnishing abundant occupation for one man; and he must have been sorely distracted by the diversity of calls upon him which his public duties involved, to say nothing of the engagements offered him by his numerous friends and admirers, such as Agostino Chigi, Count Castiglione, and Cardinal Bernardo Divizio da Bibiena, a great wit and literary celebrity, who followed Giov. de' Medici from Florence.

It was impossible that he should attend to all these matters at once, or unassisted. Hence he was compelled to leave much of the execution of his pictures to his pupils. He became head of a numerous school, artists from all parts of Italy flocked to his studio, and he exercised on all who came a remarkable influence, owing no less to the amenity and grace of his manners, than to the ascendancy of his genius. Raphael was now growing rich. He purchased a site of ground, and built a house from his own design, looking on the Piazza di S. Pietro. It stood till the time of Alexander VII., when it was pulled down to make room for the enlargement of St. Peters.

The fame of Raphael's works had now crossed the Alps. A kindred genius was there, in the person of Albert Dürer, who, wishing to give Raphael a proof of his regard, sent, in 1514 or 1515, his portrait, painted in water-colours on both sides of a piece of linen, so as to be transparent, the lights being left. This excited Raphael's wonder very much, and in return he sent two drawings to A. Dürer; one of which—a study of two naked men, models, in red chalk, one of whom he introduced in the 'Victory over the Saracens,'—is in the possession of the Archduke Charles at Vienna, with A. Dürer's MS. note. Such an instance of generous sympathy between artists does honour to human nature, and ennobles art through its professors. It is contrasted by Passavant with the reception given by Michel Angelo to Leonardo da Vinci, who came to Rome about the same time to see the artists living there, and their works, but who soon quitted the scene of the great Florentine's labours on account of his jealous and uncongenial temper, which could not bear the presence of a rival.

Some of Raphael's best oil-paintings were executed between 1514 and 1516. Of these it may be sufficient to mention two —the 'St. Cecilia of Bologna,' which, in point of purity of tone combined with depth of colour, is unsurpassed by any picture existing. It represents, if it ever can be represented, glorified humanity. Passavant compares its effect on him to the view of Alpine peaks glowing in the rosy evening light, and leading the thoughts up to the tranquil purity of heaven. The second is the 'Vision of Ezekiel,' which shows in the figure of the Almighty the influence of Michel Angelo, and is a remarkable instance of grandeur of conception and power of execution compressed within a small space.

Raphael now prosecuted his great works in the Vatican. He was engaged to decorate two more Stanze, besides the Sala de' Palafrenieri, or waiting-room for attendants, and the Loggie of the second story, a vaulted arcade leading to the Stanze.

The Stanza dell' Incendio contains four pictures, the subjects of which were chosen with a view to represent the dignity of the Papacy, by events out of the lives of two Popes of the name of Leo. The Oxford Collection possesses designs for the two last executed and most important of these frescoes, 'The Victory of Pope Leo IV. over the Saracens at Ostia,' and 'the Incendio del Borgo.' For the first of these there are two, if not three, sketches in the Oxford Collection, viz., 151, 65, and perhaps, 27. The latter is called by Passavant 'A Battle for a Standard,' and Waagen says—'I am of opinion that Raphael executed this drawing for some other purpose, and only later availed himself of it in part for this picture.' He grounds his conclusion on the difference between the group and a corresponding one in the fresco, and also on the slender proportions of the figures. One or two of the figures, it may be observed, show incompleteness of conception and hastiness in execution; but the drawing is full of life, resembling in its treatment a Greek bas-relief. The remark of Waagen's on No. 27 applies to No. 151—a sheet of paper on each side of which are represented warriors in mortal strife. The figures are full of energy and angry passions. The young man pulling at the old prisoner, whose hands are bound behind his back, and the struggles of the latter, are very fine. On the other side is an equally fine figure with his back turned, supporting a fallen combatant with the left arm, while he defends himself with the right. No. 65 is a masterly study of two captives, one of whom is prostrate, while the other defends himself against the attacks of a soldier who is not indicated here. The genuineness of these is not doubted. Not so that of the studies for the 'Incendio' (No. 33 and No. 107). Both of these are, according to Passavant, copies; the original of the first being in the collection of the Archduke Charles, at Vienna, and that of the second in the Gallery at Florence—both executed in red chalk, whereas the copies are in bistre. Nevertheless No. 33, the young man letting himself down from the wall, is a very spirited drawing, and sufficiently illustrates Vasari's remark, 'that Raphael was desirous in this picture of rivalling Michel Angelo in a display of his knowledge of the nude figure;' though if the original is as much better than the copy as Passavant declares, Raphael's work would bear comparison with Michel-Angelo's better than Vasari would allow. The picture was the last of the great frescoes of which Raphael painted any considerable portion. It has suffered much from various causes, including the restoration of many of the heads by Sebastian del Piombo, who was much blamed by Titian, (to whom he

acted as cicerone on the occasion of his visiting Rome,) for his ignorance and presumption.

One of the drawings in the Oxford Collection (No. 23), consisting of several studies in red chalk of an elephant, recalls sundry amusing associations. The elephant who was the subject of the studies was a present from John, King of Portugal, to the Pope in 1514. He was a very sagacious beast, and whenever he passed in front of the Vatican windows where the Pope was, he knelt down three times, and saluted his Holiness. He was not so polite to the crowd who gathered round him, for he invariably sprinkled them with water from his trunk, to the great amusement of the Pope. He also bore an important part in a practical joke that was played on the Abbate Baraballo of Gaeta, a miserable improvisatore, who fancied himself a second Petrarch, and whom the Pope and Cardinal da Bibiena persuaded to go in state to the Capitol, to receive a poetic crown. Accordingly, the Abbate, clad in a Roman toga, mounted upon the elephant, who was bedecked with a splendid saddle, and set off, with drums and trumpets, for the Capitol. The elephant went very quietly till he came to the bridge of St. Angelo, when, not choosing to be made a fool of any longer, he threw off the poet, who was glad to escape with nothing worse than a black eye, and with no chaplet of bays. The memory of this joke was kept up by Giovanni Barile, who represented it in wood-carving on the door which led from the Camera della Segnatura to the Stanza dell' Incendio. When the elephant died, in 1516, Raphael, we are told, painted a picture in memory of him. Passavant thinks the drawing in the University Galleries is by Giulio Romano; however this may be, it represents the unwieldy gait and rolling motion, with the loose skin of the elephant, admirably.

Raphael employed Giovanni da Udine extensively to help him to decorate the Sala de' Palafrenieri and Loggie of the Vatican with arabesques and figures of imaginary animals. The limits of this essay will not allow of a detailed description of the paintings and stuccoes in the Loggie. They are described by Passavant, vol. i. pp. 268, 269, and more in detail, vol. ii. pp. 210, 230; also by Kugler, pp. 359, 361. There are a good many designs in the Oxford Collection for the subjects out of the *Old Testament*, called 'Raphael's Bible,' painted on the vaulted ceiling, of which the principal are, No. 55, 'The Finding of Moses,' a study of three female figures and draperies in red chalk, exquisitely finished, and full of expression; No. 60, a very broad and masterly pen drawing of a group of four figures in the 'Crossing of the Red Sea.' The expression

of terror in the child's face is wonderful. No. 97, a sketch for the angel, in 'The Sacrifice of Abraham;' a masterly pen drawing: one can almost hear the rushing sound of his descent. No. 56, 'The Judgment of Moses on the sons of Levi;' and No. 58, 'Jacob wrestling with the Angel.' The two latter are sketches for the frieze-like subject under the Loggie. No. 6 is a study of boys at play, for the arabesques in the Vatican—full of fun and mischief—finely drawn with a pen. Two other studies of ornaments are probably by Giovanni da Udine. Many of these frescoes have perished, and we can only form a conception of them from contemporary or early engravings.

In 1516, according to Passavant, Raphael adopted a method of making his powers better known throughout Italy and Europe. Marc Antonio Raimondi, having engraved, by way of specimen, a drawing of Lucretia, by Raphael, was employed by the master to engrave many other of his compositions, of which, at first, Raphael used to make presents to his friends and patrons, allowing, however, the engraver to sell copies on his own account. Engraving was soon found to be a profitable trade; and Agostino Veneziano and many others followed it. By their labours works of art have become more extensively known, and many compositions, which would otherwise have left no trace of their existence, have been preserved. Marc Antonio's engravings, in particular, have this great value to the student of art, that they enable him to compare an idea of Raphael as developed in his finished work, with the same idea in a less complete, but not always inferior, state of development. It happens not unfrequently that the leading feature, the main idea, of a composition stands more prominently forward in the first sketch than in the fuller composition. This is especially the case in the subject of a large picture like the 'Murder of the Innocents,' which is to cover a great space of wall, and in which the attention would gladly concentrate itself on one principal group instead of wandering from group to group, not knowing where to rest.

In connexion with Marc Antonio, Vasari first takes occasion to mention Raphael's mistress, of whom there are two professedly genuine portraits—one in the Barberini Palace at Rome, the other in the Pitti Palace at Florence. The latter is probably the picture mentioned by Vasari. It has a remarkable likeness to the Madonna di S. Sisto at Dresden, and was probably one of Raphael's later works, and left unfinished. Many stories are told about her, and many pictures have been painted in illustration of them; but nothing is positively known, save what Vasari says—that Raphael loved her, and lived with her till within a few days of his death.

The next great work in which Raphael engaged was the preparation of ten cartoons for tapestry hangings on the walls of the Sistine Chapel. The ceiling had been finished four years before, and he had to adapt his work to bear a comparison with Michel Angelo's. He had also to bear in mind the character of the materials in which it would be executed. The cartoons were executed in distemper colours—*i.e.* colours laid on paper covered with a preparation of size. Raphael was too much occupied at this time to undertake their execution entirely himself. The first—*i.e.* 'The Miraculous Draught of Fishes,' is probably by his hand, with the exception of the birds and fishes, which are by Giov. da Udine. In the remainder we can detect the work of Fr. Penni and G. Romano—the former, by a subdued and sober tone, more careful than intellectual; the latter, by an energetic boldness, sometimes running into coarseness of execution, and heavy brick-red flesh tones. Raphael showed his judgment in making use of the materials he could command, by employing Penni in general to paint the backgrounds and middle parts of the picture, and G. Romano the foregrounds. The animation and energy of some of the heads indicate the master's own hand. Indeed, it is probable that he went over all his pupils' work, touching it where it was necessary.

There is only one drawing for this set of cartoons in the University Galleries, and that is probably a copy from Raphael —No. 100, 'The Miraculous Draught of Fishes.' There are copies by Cook of the seven cartoons, now at Hampton Court, in the picture gallery adjoining the room in which the drawings are, the present of John, Duke of Marlborough, to the University. Passavant (vol. ii. p. 258) says, wrongly, these are by Sir James Thornhill. The best description of the cartoons at Hampton Court is in Waagen's *Treasures of Art*, &c., vol. ii., letter 21. He and Passavant differ as to the date assigned to their execution. The latter, on documentary evidence, shows that Raphael received in payment for them, in 1515 and 1516, 434 ducats, in gold, and assumes that they were only just finished; whereas Waagen says that Raphael began them in his thirty-second year. They both agree as to their general characteristics—Waagen saying that they show the maturity of the artist's powers, knowledge of the laws and necessary conditions of his art, combined with the freshness of a free and creative imagination, and no less power of skilful adaptation than of original invention; and Passavant, that they represent living nature dignified and exalted,—that they combine dramatic force in the treatment, and the highest artistic power in the handling,—the plastic grandeur of Giotto with the power of

detail of the beginning of the sixteenth century,—the devotional feeling of the early Christian painters with that refinement of taste and perception of the beautiful which is acquired by the study of Greek art. Never, according to Raphael's biographer, were the workings of the human mind more justly represented in outward action, or ideas of moral and spiritual life more forcibly conveyed to the mind through the medium of form and colour.

These are as good specimens of *orthodox* criticism on Raphael's cartoons as we can meet with. They enable us fairly to appreciate the grounds on which the admiration of three centuries has been founded, and to look on the cartoons from a point of view from which the best critics of art have hitherto agreed in regarding them. It was reserved for the latter half of the nineteenth century that a new judgment should be formed of these famous works, based, not upon the *dicta* of connoisseurs, but on the earnest study of the sacred records. This judgment is pronounced by Mr. Ruskin, who, in his third volume of *Modern Painters*, part iv., chapter iv., compares Raphael's treatment of sacred subjects with the Word of God—paraphrased, it is true, into Carlyle's diction, more energetic than reverent in form, but sufficiently faithful in reality. The comparison is not favourable to Raphael as a truthful and, at the same time, an imaginative painter. And it will be very difficult to repel the charges Mr. Ruskin makes by meeting him on his own ground. At the same time, it is open to any one to dispute the fairness of his ground. Any one may fairly say, 'Raphael's rendering of Scripture subjects does not come up to the idea which Protestant England in the nineteenth century should entertain of religious art.' But was anything better to be expected from the Pope's painter in the sixteenth century? Is it fair to condemn the artist for following the received theological opinions of his age? I do not intend to go into this question on the present occasion. I would only remark, on quitting the subject of the cartoons, that great allowances are to be made for those who have not the power, even if they have the will, of becoming intimately acquainted with scenes of the Apostles' history. A thinking man with a Bible in his hand is more than a match for any one—be his powers great as they may—who only receives such fragments of divine truth as priests and cardinals vouchsafe to dole out to him. So long as revelation is obscured by the Bible being a sealed book, there can be no true religious art. A man needs to be brought into the clear light of day before he can discern objects—their dimensions and forms, and bearing upon other objects,—and when these are once discerned, all he wants is

time for meditation and opportunities of reproducing what he has seen; but in papal Rome, at the beginning of the sixteenth century, this was impossible, for the light ecclesiastical was no better than an *ignis fatuus*, and there was none other to be had till honest Martin Luther drew one out of his monastery, and well nigh burnt his fingers in so doing. So that Raphael is no more to be blamed for not representing scenes taken from the New Testament faithfully, than Mr. Fox Talbot would be for failing to give an accurate representation, by the *calotype* process, of the interior of the House of Commons, when he was standing with his apparatus under one of the gas-lamps outside. Other faults he may deserve blame for, but not for this.

Besides the ten cartoons above enumerated, Raphael made another for the altar-piece of the Sistine Chapel, viz. 'The Crowning of the Virgin Mary.' This was also worked in tapestry, and may be regarded as the centre or *focus* of all the paintings in the chapel, representing, as it does, the three persons of the Holy Trinity. In this composition—which is only preserved to us by engravings of A. Veneziano, and 'The Master with the Die,'—he preserved the severe symmetrical arrangement of the earlier masters. There is a sketch for this in the University Galleries (No. 110), a masterly pen drawing, representing the Virgin sitting on a throne with her Son. She bows her head and folds her hands across her bosom in humble adoration, whilst He smiles at her with an expression of ineffable love. The Apostle Peter stands on the left with St. Jerome and a third figure. The Apostle Paul and another saint stand on the right. The saints' figures are finely imagined, and sketched with great freedom and power.

In the winter of 1515-16, the Pope called away Raphael, with other architects, to Florence, as he wanted a façade added to Brunelleschi's Church of St. Lorenzo. Michel Angelo was of the number, and declared himself so strongly against competition, that the idea was given up, and he was entrusted with the work. It was never, however, completed; since, owing to delays, the money designed for the purpose was squandered before all preliminaries were ready. This journey prevented Raphael from finishing an altar-piece which he had undertaken to complete by the 15th of August, 1517, for the Church of Monte Luce at Perugia.

It is impossible to give a clear idea of the order in which Raphael painted his Holy Families and Madonnas. Nevertheless, the date of some of the chief ones is known,—viz. 'La Perla,' a study for which (No. 34) is in the University Galleries, 1517. The 'Madonna della Sedia' belongs to the same period. It is entirely from Raphael's hand, and is one

of the most beautiful of his works which do not pretend to an exalted character. The story of Raphael's sketching a young mother and her child on the end of a cask is well known, and has been often chosen for a subject by painters. It is precisely one of those stories which a philosopher of the modern German school would say was framed to account for the shape of the picture, but which any artist or person practically conversant with art will regard as extremely probable, knowing how frequently the shape of a composition is determined by mere external circumstances. The invention is moreover purely unnecessary, as round pictures at this time were very common. The picture of 'St. Michael trampling on Satan,' now in the Louvre, was painted in 1517, to represent symbolically, according to Passavant, the Church of Rome triumphant over the Reformers,—a very gratifying vision, doubtless, to the friends of the Papacy, not destined to be realized. Francis I., for whom it was painted, was so delighted with it, that he remunerated Raphael for it on a truly royal scale. The artist, not to be outdone in generosity, painted, with the help of G. Romano, the 'Great Holy Family,' now in the Louvre, and sent it as a mark of his gratitude to the king. It was accompanied by the 'St. Margaret,' also in the Louvre. Francis I. was so struck by Raphael's generosity, and charmed with the new specimens of his powers as an artist, that he sent him 24,000 livres in return, and used all his endeavours to induce him to come to Paris. Raphael, however, was too fully engaged with the building of St. Peter's to accept his invitation. The 'Madonna di S. Sisto' closes the list of Raphael's Madonnas, and deservedly, both as regards the subject and its beauty. It is remarkable as having been painted apparently without any previous design. There is, however, a sketch for one of the boy angels in the British Museum. Passavant well calls it 'a vision carried into the realms of reality.' When Correggio saw the picture at its original destination, at Piacenza, he exclaimed, 'Anch' io son pittore!' That his exclamation in its literal sense was justified is a matter on which there are scarcely two opinions. Nay, he might fairly claim a superiority over Raphael in chiaroscuro, and in the natural tone of his flesh-colour; but he is certainly inferior in elevation, in its sense of harmony and propriety, and in accurate drawing. We may look through Correggio's pictures in the Dresden Gallery, and through all that he ever painted in oils, without finding anything so full of dignity as the Infant Saviour in Raphael's picture, who sits like a king in his mother's arms. About this time (1518) Raphael executed a promise made some time before to A. Chigi, to decorate the

loggie of his palace with frescoes. He chose the story of Cupid and Psyche from *Apuleius;* made the designs, and perhaps the cartoons, himself; and painted one figure as a specimen of the manner in which his pupils were to execute the rest. This is the figure of one of the Graces. His pupils did not in any degree keep up to the model given them; and as many pictures which left Raphael's studio were executed entirely, or in great part, by his pupils, now numerous, a report got abroad that Raphael was falling off. He was not unmoved by this, and gladly received a commission from Cardinal Giulio de' Medici to paint for him an altar-piece, the subject being 'The Transfiguration of our Lord.' Sebastian del Piombo received a commission simultaneously from the same cardinal to paint an altar-piece, the subject being 'The Raising of Lazarus.' Michel Angelo helped the latter, a fact which is proved by the existence of several drawings formerly in the Lawrence, now in the Oxford Collection. When Raphael heard of this, he said, 'Michel Angelo does me great honour, in thinking me worthy to enter the lists, not with Sebastian, but with himself.'

In the last years of Raphael's life he devoted much of his attention to the subject of excavations, and to the contemplated restoration of ancient Rome. A letter of his to the Pope on this subject is preserved (Passavant, vol. i., app. xiii.). Raphael also sent persons to different parts of Italy, and even Greece, to make drawings of ancient buildings. He made not a few studies from antique sculptures, some of which, or copies of them, are in the University Galleries—*v. g.* No. 137, 'A Roman Emperor in Armour;' No. 37, a torso of 'Venus'—probably the original study, drawn in pen and ink;—No. 74, 'A Study of the Female Figure, reposing,' which is now in the Louvre, and is variously called a Sleeping Nymph, Ariadne, and Cleopatra, under which title the drawing has been engraved by Marc Antonio. Raphael also left some notes on a translation of Vitruvius, and other remarks in MS. relating to classical antiquities, which Vasari highly praises.

He was now employed to furnish designs for the Hall of Constantine, a room leading to the Pope's Chambers in the Vatican, in which he was to paint several remarkable incidents in the life of Constantine the Great, with a view of representing the foundation of the visible power of the Church. He had already made several designs, and finished the cartoon of the 'Battle of Constantine against Maxentius.' He now determined to try a new experiment, and employ oil colours instead of painting in fresco, in order that he might rival the rich colouring of the Venetians. Two allegorical figures—of Justice and Mercy—were accordingly painted by his directions,

as an experiment, by G. Romano and Fr. Penni. No more was done in his lifetime.

There are three studies for the 'Battle of Constantine' in the University Galleries, all drawn in black chalk. No. 10, a man sitting on a stone, raising his right arm, as if to protect himself against an attack: an excellent drawing from the naked model. No. 53, a study of two soldiers in the water, one of whom is in the act of climbing into a boat; the other —here drawn as a separate study—is the figure who is seen clinging to the first: a very fine drawing, in which the stump appears to have been used. No. 32, a man fallen to the earth, supporting himself on the left arm: a study of equal excellence with the two others, the figure finely foreshortened. These three sketches show great freedom, more attention being paid to the breadth of light and shade than to modelling the limbs. They were evidently executed with great rapidity.

Raphael now (1519) set to work at the 'Transfiguration,' of which he intended to execute every part himself, to show what his powers really were. Accordingly he made numerous and careful studies for it, of which at least two are in the University Galleries. No. 1, two Apostles' heads, the youthful one who stoops forward, and the one above, who is just behind him; also the two hands of the first, and two stretched forward; and No. 141, the Apostle's head who stoops forward over the youthful one. His countenance expresses doubt, mixed with disgust, at seeing the inability of himself and the other Apostles to cure the dæmoniac boy. Three other studies of hands and feet, belonging to the same composition (No. 25, No. 135, and No. 138), once belonged to a cartoon, which is pricked through in the outlines, in order to serve for the execution of a picture. Passavant thinks they are fragments, of which several have been found at different intervals, belonging to the cartoon which Giovanni Fr. Penni completed, in order to make his well-known copy from Raphael's picture.

This was the last work in which Raphael was engaged. It never received the finishing touches, but was left all but completed at his death, which took place on Good Friday, 1520, on the day on which he completed his thirty-seventh year. The cause of his death, according to the most reliable accounts, was a fever, caught whilst superintending the excavations which were being carried on in an unhealthy part of the city. This, added to the immense strain upon his mind, from which he had never been free since 1514, is quite enough to account for his constitution—never robust—giving way, without the additional

cause which Vasari gives; though nothing is more likely than that the doctors made his case worse by bleeding.

Raphael left his house to Cardinal da Bibiena, his works of art to his pupils, Giovanni Fr. Penni and Giulio Pippi. He was buried in the Pantheon, amid the tears of all Rome. Bembo wrote his epitaph. Ariosto and others composed elegies on his death. One of the most touching expressions of grief for his loss is by Count Castiglione, who, in a letter written to his mother, July, 1520, says,—'I am well, but cannot believe myself to be in Rome, now that my poor Rafael is no more. God rest his soul!'

It is now time to speak of Raphael's manner of working, or, more strictly speaking, his method of study, and to trace it in the drawings in the University Galleries. In his boyhood he seems to have copied with affectionate admiration the sketches of his master, sometimes in pen and ink, sometimes in chalk, using white freely for the lights. The drawings of this period which the Oxford Collection possesses show a marked attention to attitude and expression—little to anatomy, and light and shade. He had not learned to vie with nature in her variety of outline, her subtlety of light and shade, her assertion of anatomical structure within the human form. He seems, at first, to have been contented with such an approximation to truth in these respects as satisfied a mind accustomed to the conventional harmonies, and the subdued and chastened expression of the Umbrian school. He did not think it necessary to make studies from the nude. It was enough for him to place his models in a graceful, sometimes an affected attitude, clothed in the close-fitting dress of the period. If a building was to be introduced, he took care to draw it from such a point of view as showed the perspective in which, as a pupil of Perugino, he was well versed. All his drawings of this period are *painter's* drawings. He does not appear to have aimed at elaborate finish, like an Academy student contending for a prize; but as soon as he had got what he wanted for his picture, he appears to have stopped. This is especially obvervable in the study for 'St. Jerome,' (No. 12, Oxford Cat.) In this the head, of which the expression is very devotional, is finished, whilst the lower part of the figure is only indicated. Finish, for its own sake, Raphael never seems to have added in his preparatory drawings. He reserved this for his paintings. He appears to have paid particular attention to the outline; correcting it, when false, and strengthening it when feeble, especially in those parts on which he wished to lay particular emphasis. Hands and feet appear to have given him a good deal of trouble. It is amusing to see some of his early studies,

such as that in the drawing, No. 17, Oxford Catalogue, which by the bye, Passavant considers to be of the school of Perugino, but not by Raphael. There is an air of triumph at a difficulty being accomplished in the distinct marking of the oft corrected outline; there is the hand, a thorough drawing-master's specimen; 'like to the sign of the hand,' Falstaff would say. From this childhood of art Raphael soon emerged; a flowing, easy outline came naturally to him, as it must to every man of intense feeling for physical beauty and the fulness of life, to whom God has given the power of delineation.

During the four years which he devoted to the study of his art at Florence, Raphael learned to look upon a more truthful representation of nature, as essential to the ends of art. He was no longer satisfied with the conventional attitudes, with the uniformity of expression, and studied grace, not free from affectation, which characterized the works of his master Perugino. The Florentine taste lay more in the way of realization of external life, not as a whole, but as an aggregate of parts, each perfect in themselves. Academic correctness of drawing and power of detail were highly prized. These qualities were wonderfully displayed in the two great cartoons of Leonardo da Vinci and Michel Angelo. From these Raphael appears to have acquired new conceptions of the capabilities of his art. Accurate drawing of the human figure, involving a thorough knowledge of its bones and muscles, and the application of the science of perspective to its foreshortenings, began to assume greater importance in his eyes. The longer that he studied at Florence, the more was this the case. His earlier Florentine drawings are of two kinds—viz. studies from models and works of older artists, and sketches for his own compositions. The former of these are generally executed with a metallic point on prepared paper. Of these, several in the University Galleries possess a very high degree of interest. They show Raphael's anxiety to acquire, and appropriate to himself, the excellences of those masters to the study of whose works he devoted himself. No better specimen of this kind can be desired than the sheet of studies marked No. 44, in which his imitation of Leonardo da Vinci, mentioned before, is shown no less by the group of horsemen from the 'Battle of the Standard,' sketched on a small scale, than by the head in profile, drawn with a strong outline after the manner of Leonardo, but with the peculiar character of hatching which distinguishes Raphael's drawings at this period. A similar sheet of studies (No. 108) is of the same time and like character. Both these specimens show a greater attention

to modelling than the earlier drawings, at the same time that the chaste character of the Perugino period is retained. About this period Raphael's sketches began to be marked with a greater air of originality. In his sketches of Madonnas, several of which are in the Oxford Collection, he seems to have drawn alternately from the nude or draped model, himself arranging the attitude, and to have imagined, or drawn from recollection, graceful figures in simple, yet dignified attitudes. These retain occasionally a reminiscence of the Madonnas of Fra Angelico and the early Florentine painters; but, generally speaking, they exhibit Raphael's aim to portray naturally, according to motives suggested by living models, and the daily intercourse of social life, the tranquil enjoyment of maternal love. No subject better suited his own character at this time, and in none was he more successful. His sketches are for the most part rapidly executed in outline with a pen—sometimes shaded in bistre; such is the study for the picture called 'The Madonna in Green,' in the Gallery of the Belvedere, Vienna, marked No. 19. This is evidently made from a model. The figure of the Virgin is most finished; that of St. John very slightly marked in with broad washes of a brush, with such wonderful truth and feeling for nature as no artist could attain to without a living model before him, or one actually present to his imagination. Any one who desires to see with what rapidity a great artist can put down his ideas on paper, will do well to study this sketch. Another sketch of the same period, No. 113, representing the Virgin reading a book, and the infant Saviour standing before her, is drawn with the pen. Both of these studies are evidently ideas for pictures. They are both natural and unconventional, unless, indeed, the adoption of the pyramidal form in No. 19 be considered a mark of conventionality. Simple naturalism is also the character of another drawing, No. 63, in which Raphael—or according to Passavant, one of his pupils—represented a woman suckling her child. If this drawing be from the hand of Raphael, it proves that his love for simple domestic scenes prompted him to make studies which his reverential feeling prevented his making use of, as motives for sacred subjects: for he has never painted the Virgin and Child in the action represented by this sketch. The last of these early Florentine sketches to which the reader's attention is directed is No. 121, a design for the picture called 'Madonna del Cardellino,' in the Tribune at Florence. This differs from the picture, as the child is looking at the book which the Virgin holds, and the bird is omitted; the Baptist also is in a quiet position. A very graceful and expressive,

though slight drawing. It is instructive, as showing how Raphael retained portions of an original design, adopting in his finished composition motives which recommended themselves to him in the interval.

We now come to a subject on which Raphael seems to have bestowed greater labour than on any of the preceding, namely, 'The Entombment of Christ.' There are six studies for this subject in the University Galleries, numbered respectively 4, 89, 106, 119, 120, 124; of these only three are considered by Passavant to be from the hand of Raphael—viz. 4, 119, 120; and the latter is the only one which he entitles a study for the picture in the Borghese Palace. This will sufficiently show us Raphael's manner of study for an important picture. It is a pen drawing of three naked figures,—two men, who bear the body of Christ, and a third standing on the left: the body of our Lord is slightly indicated in red chalk. This drawing brings us into the midst of the Florentine Academy. We can imagine Raphael and his friends, Timoteo della Vite and Taddeo Taddei, the one taking the interest of an artist, the other of an amateur, in the grouping and arranging of the models; and we can picture to ourselves the countenance of the youthful painter intent upon his work, yet showing a mind ready to receive suggestions or to give them to others, if required. In this study we have an evidence of the pains that Raphael took to give his picture all that truth of representation which the most accurate study of the human figure could convey. It is very instructive to mark the use that he has made of earlier motives. Keeping the severe arrangement of Andrea Mantegna constantly before his mind, he endeavoured to give his own composition as much life as possible. In the 'Pietà,' marked No. 119, he appears to have added to the design several figures of his own conception. The existence of so many studies—for besides these in the Oxford Collection there is the celebrated one in the Louvre, not to mention others,—shows how much importance Raphael assigned to the treatment of the subject; how earnestly he laboured to introduce into his composition every element which could render it more perfect—grace and harmony of outline, dramatic expression brought out by contrast, and knowledge of anatomy, —all these and other particulars being subordinated in various degrees to the main feeling of the picture, namely, a tender pathos, and profound sentiment of grief. The sheet of studies marked No. 89, shows the different effect produced by the same feeling of grief on persons of different sex, age, and character. Passavant does not think that this fine drawing is from Raphael's hand; however that may be, it shows us the method

of study which the master adopted and recommended to his pupils, and it enables us to appreciate the value of laborious study in the attempt to represent an action by its moral effects on the *dramatis personæ*, no less than by their outward attitude. It was in his constant aim to represent the workings of the mind that Raphael showed his philosophic insight. Without the profound mental analysis which distinguished Leonardo da Vinci, or the terrible grandeur of Michel Angelo, Raphael possessed a greater capacity than any other painter for reflecting the various emotions of the mind, as they express themselves in the human countenance and gestures. His mind was, at this time at least, like a faithful mirror, in which we see the reflections of all objects alike. If the mirror was in any way coloured, it was by his early associations of the school of Perugino, which shed a subdued tone of tender melancholy and devotion over natural objects. Afterwards we shall find the mirror taking another tone. We shall see Raphael viewing life through a twofold lens: grave subjects he regarded through the medium of classical literature and art: hence, as Mr. Ruskin says (*Modern Painters*, vol. iii.), he represented the Apostles under the garb of Greek philosophers; whilst subjects of a less elevated character were treated by him in a frank spirit of cheerful enjoyment,—taking the Italian Contadine as types for his Madonnas, and their lusty-limbed children for his Infant Saviour and John the Baptist, not without all reminiscence of Cupid or the infant Hercules of Greek sculpture. But at present we have to tax him with no such perversion. On the contrary, we trace in the drawings of his Florentine period—especially the latter half of it—a conscientious feeling for truth and propriety of character, unimpaired by the requirements of a luxurious age, or the prevalence of classical taste. An inspection of these drawings will convince every one that, although art and chance are lovingly connected, art and labour are not less intimately united; that facility of execution is the result, not alone of a natural gift, but also of severe and painstaking study; that, to use Murillo's words, it takes a long time to learn to paint rapidly; and that the imagination of a painter is not a heaven-sent quality which enables him, without thought or study, to see an action with all its outward circumstances represented with dramatic force and propriety of expression, but a gift to be improved by cultivation, to be called into activity by conscious effort, by meditation, and by striving after completeness. Doubtless, the virtues of academic study have been overrated. They were so by the Caracci; they were so, too, by Sir Joshua Reynolds; and it is melancholy to think of the

waste of time which aspirant painters, with no talent, may have been led to make, by the worthy President's sincere and, at that time, useful recommendation of labour; for had they not learned to mar canvas, they might have been taught to make shoes; but some exaggeration of this part of a painter's function is surely better than teaching him and mankind in general to believe that an artist '*nascitur, non fit,*' and that his finest works are the entire result of spontaneous, unconscious effort,—the working of an inspiration of which he is the unreflecting instrument.

There are only two more studies belonging to this period to which the reader's attention will be called—one, No. 95, a sketch from life, of seven persons sitting at an oblong table, probably a study for a 'Last Supper;' and also that marked No. 48, which Passavant takes to be a study for the person of God the Father, in a representation of the Holy Trinity, but which answers much better to the description in the Catalogue—'A Monk, preaching.' These are very interesting drawings, as showing how Raphael went about to public places of resort to get motives for his pictures. There is an air of reality about them both, which shows they must have been drawn from life, and rapidly executed. Both of them also produce the same kind of pleasure—namely, that which results from seeing an effect produced great in proportion to the means which are used to produce it. They are both drawn with the metal point, on tinted paper. In the study for 'The Last Supper' a little white is used for the lights; otherwise, the studies are merely outlines. Yet, in No. 95 the figures retire behind one another, and the hands and more prominent parts of the person come forward to an extent that few finished pictures, with the advantages of chiaroscuro and colour, can surpass. As for the monk, we see nothing but the outline of a head, and two hands raised in giving the benediction; yet we have the whole man; we can almost hear him speaking. Never was an idea conveyed by fewer strokes, nor were the fruits of study—a free and firm hand, rapid execution, and correct outline of the foreshortened figure—more signally manifested.

The works in which Raphael was engaged during his residence at Perugia, Urbino, and Florence, were chiefly oil-paintings. This circumstance determined the nature of his preparatory designs. For an oil-picture it is not absolutely necessary to prepare a cartoon—*i.e.* a working drawing of the same size as the finished composition: since the nature of the medium used in oil-painting allows of frequent alteration and re-touching of the work. The work of hours may, if unsatisfactory, be obliterated before the paint is dry, and done over again. Even

after the paint is dry, mistakes may be corrected, by being painted over, and new ideas introduced. It is better when this is not the case—when the colours, once laid on, are not disturbed or painted over; but, nevertheless, with skilful management, important alterations may be made in a picture during the process of its being painted. In fresco-painting proper* the case is different. As the colours are laid on the wet plaster, so they must remain to dry; and when dry they cannot be obliterated, except by destroying the plaster. Hence, it is usual before beginning a work in fresco, to prepare cartoons beforehand, on paper or linen, which is fastened against the wall or ceiling to be painted, and the outline of the portion to be executed during the day is pricked through, enabling the artist, with a very little trouble, to complete the outline, correcting with his brush any errors which arise in the mechanical process. In painting the ceiling of the Sistine Chapel, Michel Angelo, it is believed, was independent of this aid; but Raphael generally, if not universally, availed himself of it, executing the cartoons partly himself, partly employing his pupils, especially Giulio Romano and Giov. Fran. Penni. Considering the nature of Raphael's occupations after he was called away to Rome—namely, that he was engaged first by Pope Julius II. and afterwards by Leo X. to decorate the interior of the Vatican with fresco paintings, it is reasonable to assume that he must have executed a great number of cartoons; and, judging from the care which is taken of such works by connoisseurs, it would seem probable that many should have been preserved. This is, however, not the case. We possess some of the most important specimens in this country—namely, the cartoons for the tapestries which were wrought in Flanders, and hung up in the Vatican a few months before Raphael's death; and in the National Gallery there is a fragment of a cartoon of the 'Murder of the Innocents.' Other fragments remain, such as that marked No. 130 in the University Galleries, representing a female head in the 'Murder of the Innocents,' and No. 133, representing the horse's head in the fresco of Heliodorus. The first of these is probably a copy. In this and every other respect the horse's head is by far the most important of the two. It is full of animation and life, resembling not a little one of the horse's heads taken from the pediment of the Parthenon.

With the aid of these fragments, we are enabled to follow Raphael through the work of preparation for one of his great pictures. We will suppose the artist to have had an interview

* See Eastlake's *Materials for a History of Oil Painting*, ch. vi. p. 147.

with the pontiff, and to have received from him general instructions as to the kind of subjects with which he wished the particular Stanza of the Vatican to be adorned. We may then imagine him buried for a time in profound meditation, calling up to his mind all the associations of his former life—floating visions of saint-like forms, first seen by him at Perugia, and then imagined by himself in fuller reality,—recollections of intimate converse with the most highly gifted men of his time, overflowing with the spirit of Plato newly evolved from the tomb where it had slumbered for centuries,—and, deeper still, scenes from that great poem which, in the thirteenth century, awakened Italy to a sense that she had a language and a literature, and shaped the imagination of poet and artist through many a long year. 'All these and more,' doubtless, 'came flocking' to the artist's call as he meditated on the mighty work before him. Then were his knowledge of the human frame, and of its adaptation to express feelings of the mind—all his academic studies, and recollections of Giotto, and Fra Angelico, and Filippo Lippi, and Masaccio, and of the wondrous realization of life displayed in those two giants of art, Leonardo and Michel Angelo,—summoned up to his aid. We may imagine his eagerness to transfer his first ideas to paper; the intense feeling which guided his pen or pencil in these early fruits of his invention. Then, after he had satisfied, or partly satisfied, his mind in the first sketch, showing the treatment of the subject, we may follow him in imagination to his academy, and watch him as he arranges his models in the required attitudes. With what rapidity does the master work! how easy does it seem for his hand to trace the flowing lines of life! how faithfully he represents what he sees; not altering a fold in the drapery, or a line in the figure, in this stage of his work! What satisfaction does the realization in nature of the forms, the attitudes, the shades of expression which he has imagined, give to the artist; and what a feeling of unsatisfied longing does the discovery leave behind, that neither Rome nor its neighbourhood can furnish models which come up to his ideas of venerable old age, of vigorous manhood, of feminine grace and tenderness! The Roman models strike him at first as somewhat clumsy; he still introduces in his first *sketches* the more graceful and slender proportions of the Florentines. But in his *studies* his love for truth will not allow him to depart from what he sees: for a time he corrects this seeming want of proportion in his cartoons; but afterwards he becomes accustomed to it, and paints figures, no longer eight heads or more in height, but only seven, according to the proportions of the Romans.

And now we suppose the studies for particular parts of a great picture finished. What remains, but to put together in a finished drawing the results of separate study, or to proceed at once to the execution of the cartoon? The latter was Raphael's usual method. As we have seen before, he only looked upon his drawings as means to an end—that end being the production of a work in oil colours or in fresco. Consequently he seldom, if ever, delayed the execution of one of his great works through scrupulous care of perfecting the studies for it. Such was the common practice of Michel Angelo (possibly because he was not in the habit of making cartoons for his frescoes), but not, at this time, of Raphael. In the Oxford Collection it is questionable whether any finished drawings of entire compositions by Raphael's own hand exist, such as those which he made for Marc Antonio's engravings of 'St. Cecilia' and 'The Pest.' Those that are found there are most probably by Penni, or some other pupil of Raphael. At the time when he began the fresco painting called 'The Dispute of the Sacrament,' he was inexperienced in the requisite proportions of the figures in so large a composition. Hence the figures in that noble work appear to be smaller than life size. This error he gradually corrected. Another defect is observable in the same composition—viz. the isolation of the groups of figures, and that also of the separate figures. This was a peculiarity which Raphael had brought with him from Florence. The Florentines, before the time of Leonardo da Vinci and Michel Angelo, preserved, in their historical pictures, a resemblance to the style of portraits —each figure standing out separately. Raphael, too, always liked a clear outline. So, in the Borghese 'Entombment,' we are struck by a certain hardness and dryness of outline; and 'The Dispute' is not exempt from the same fault. In the studies for the latter picture in the University Galleries we can detect the same peculiarity. In No. 25, which represents Mary and John the Baptist, and other saints grouped around the person of the Saviour, we have already noticed the distinctness of the different figures. Raphael's manner of drawing at this time was calculated to preserve a clear, if not a hard outline. His drawings are for the most part executed with the pen, or with a metallic point. Admitting, as they do, of any amount of finish, both these methods are capable of conveying a distinct image by a mere outline. To this was frequently added a slight bistre wash, giving the principal shadows, whilst the lights were laid on in white upon grey paper. Afterwards Raphael frequently used red chalk for his studies, as giving a softer texture, more like the surface of the human

body. One of the earliest studies by him in red chalk is the design for a bas-relief under the statue of Apollo, in the 'School of Athens.' From this time he used it constantly, and some of his finest drawings in the Oxford University Collection are executed in this way; for instance, No. 46, a drawing of a Sibyl for the 'Chiesa della Pace;' No. 55, a design for 'the Finding of Moses,' and No. 34, a study for the head of Elizabeth, in the Holy Family, called 'La Perla,' now at Madrid. The latter is one of the most masterly drawings ever executed. The studies for 'The Transfiguration' are all in black chalk; they are very broad in the handling, and appear to have been executed with the aid of a stump, of which we find no traces in Raphael's earlier drawings.

In his *sketches*, Raphael was not always careful to place nature before his eyes, but gave his imagination play. We sometimes find his figures placed in impossible or unlikely attitudes. An instance of the latter is in the design of 'Samson rending the Lion,' a pen-sketch of surprising vigour, in which, however, he has not consulted the truth of nature; had he done so, instead of making both the knees of Samson bent, he would have straightened the hinder leg, in order to throw all the force of the body into the knee in advance, with which he crushes down the lion, and into the arms, with which he rends him. The lion, too, looks a very young one, and not a fair match for his herculean antagonist. Inaccuracies of this kind do not in the least diminish the interest of such drawings. It is as rapid sketches—as first ideas—that they come before us; and they certainly succeed in conveying to the mind the idea of the artist better than the most elaborate study.

Let us now revert to the external circumstances under which Raphael was placed at the three periods of his life, corresponding to his three styles, or manners, of painting, the characteristics of which have been already given.

Urbino, where he was born, lies at a considerable elevation above the sea, in the district of the Apennines. The town, which is strongly fortified, stands on one of the ridges which rise, one above another, from the coast of the Adriatic. The surrounding country is rocky, the air pure and bracing, and the inhabitants of a free and independent spirit, combining the enthusiastic devotion of the Southern, with the simplicity, courage, and loyalty of the Transalpine nations. Their princes were of the race of Montefeltro, renowned alike in the council and the field, and not less remarkable for their attachment to the Fine Arts. Giovanni Santi, the father of Raphael, though not trained in the school of Verocchio, or any of the

most renowned masters of the day, was, as his works show, possessed of considerable talent. He had the good taste to appreciate the merits of Andrea Mantegna, of whom he says, in his *Chronicle of the Deeds of Frederico, Duke of Urbino*, written in *terza rima*, that 'Heaven opened to him the gates of painting.' To his works in the neighbourhood of Urbino, and those of Angelico da Fiesole, John van Eyck, Gentile da Fabriano, and Paolo Uccelli, the admiration of the youthful Raphael was probably drawn. He had, therefore, good opportunities of becoming acquainted with early Naturalism, and the tender Purism characteristic of the Umbrian schools. Neither of these influences were lost upon him. They helped, doubtless, to preserve the balance of his youthful mind, and laid the seeds of that excellent judgment which preserved him, during his years of study, from one-sided imitation of any master. Finding, as they did, corresponding sentiments in his mind, they caused him, when studying under Perugino, to aim at greater truth of nature; and when working in the Florentine Academy, to temper the peculiarities of that school with the tender melancholy and deep-souled devotion of his first master and the painters of the Umbrian schools.

The external circumstances under which Raphael's genius developed itself were unusually favourable. The spirit of the age in which he grew up was one of great external refinement and classical taste. It is true that this did not penetrate deep into society; but the most eminent men in Italy—at Rome, Florence, and Urbino—were full of the spirit of Greek poetry, philosophy, and art; and much was therefore expected of painters. The Florentine school, between the time of Giotto and that of Leonardo da Vinci, did not come up to these requirements. Masaccio was the only really great painter during that period; and he lived too short a time to found a school. Men's minds were, consequently, prepared to welcome an artist of real genius; one who would do something more than imitate Giotto with the same fidelity that essays of the time of Confucius are imitated at the present day by Chinese aspirants for academic honours. Whilst the moral atmosphere of Florence was, on this and other grounds, favourable to the growth of artists, that of the court of Urbino was no less so. After the return of Giudubaldo I., the ducal court was, as we have seen, frequented by the most eminent literary men of the day, with whom Raphael became acquainted. From his daily intercourse with them, he imbibed a philosophical insight into the nature and requirements of art, and into one of its noblest subjects,—human action. At Urbino, then, his mind received

a bias which it never lost, and which stamped his works with a character peculiar to them,—sometimes their glory, at other times their bane. It was a fortunate circumstance that the thoughts of the most highly gifted Christian painter were early brought into contact with the master minds of ancient Greece, because of their true elevation of sentiment, and because no other writers are so conspicuous for their attention to the form in which they clothe their thoughts; but it was to be lamented that he imbibed so great a reverence for antiquity as to lose the sense of the greater moral dignity of Christianity, and should have bewitched the Italians of the sixteenth century with his classic treatment of sacred subjects. For the sake of Italy it would have been better had Raphael studied Dante more and Plato less; but even Dante was so reverential an admirer of classic antiquity, and Petrarca in the fourteenth century, and Ariosto with his contemporaries in the beginning of the sixteenth, were so bent on a revival of Greek literature, that Raphael would have been more than mortal had he not yielded to the prevailing influence. He did so, and we owe the 'School of Athens' to it. But his sacred subjects are deteriorated by that very tone which gave truth and elevation to his historical subjects.

There was another spirit at the same time, locked up, it is true, in the bosoms of a few great men, but not without its influence on the art of the period,—the spirit of Naturalism. It had already begun to manifest itself at Venice and at Florence, and had taken root and yielded fruits at Nüremberg and Ghent. It was a fortunate coincidence for Raphael, that at the very period when his powers were ripening into maturity, and when he most needed help in interpreting the book of nature, two such great teachers as Leonardo da Vinci and Michel Angelo should have arisen, to show with what fidelity the structure of the human form might be rendered by means of outline and chiaroscuro; and that, when he sought to make his renderings of nature no less true in colour than in form, he should have become acquainted, for the first time, with the deep tones and luminous colouring of Giorgione. So far, then, as example could make a painter, Raphael had everything that could be desired. He had before him, and working with him, men of deep insight into nature,—men who reverenced truth and beauty,—men whose intellects, and feelings, and imaginations were alive, and who employed their gifts in the noble endeavour to bring the works of the Creator, in their fullest manifestation, into intimate union with the spirit of man.

Hitherto we have regarded Raphael as the receiver of certain

influences belonging to his time and country, or his manner of education. But it must be remembered, that the receptive element is only one which goes to form a painter. Without a proper sphere of development, the highest æsthetic faculties must languish and decay, or become dwarfed in their growth, —or, at all events, unproductive of great results. A painter without an opportunity to put forth his powers, is like an army without a basis of operations. Unable to do his proper work in life, and feeling this acutely, he falls into despondency; he becomes 'demoralized;' his faculties become diseased; his inner man is full of mutiny and discontent; he vainly endeavours to wreak his vengeance on society by uttering bitter invectives, which the world receives as expressions of a mind diseased, or else as truisms; and he sinks into his grave, broken in heart and health, the victim of that penury which has 'repressed his noble rage,' and writhing under a practical sense of the satirist's exclamation,—

> Nil habet infelix paupertas durius in se,
> Quam quod ridiculos homines facit.

Such was not the case with Raphael. No sooner had he learned the technical part of his art, and formed a due conception of its ends and requirements—no sooner was his mind trained to a familiarity with the subjects and modes of thought of the age in which he lived—no sooner did he feel the want of a larger theatre for the exercise of his matured powers than either Florence or Urbino could supply, than he received an invitation to take up his abode at Rome. There, under Julius II., his intercourse with the great and learned was not interrupted, and the sphere of his artistic labours was immeasurably extended. The external grandeur of the city, with all its historical associations and monuments of antiquity, and the consciousness of the presence of the head of the Western Church, in the person of Julius II.—who, however little his character might correspond to the Apostolic ideal of a spiritual ruler, was a very fit representative of the temporal power of the Church;—these were sufficient to inspire the thoughts of the youthful Raphael, and fill him with a noble ambition to rival the great works of antiquity, and to lend the aid of his wonder-working pencil to the great object which Julius II. had in view, that of rendering the City of the Seven Hills the local centre of all that was great in the world of art and letters, as well as the fountain head of all spiritual and temporal power in Western Europe. The decoration of the Vatican with paintings in fresco was of itself a mighty work, sufficient for the energies of one man for a large portion of his life; and it would

have been well for Raphael and for art had he been allowed to continue in the exercise of his talents in this, their proper channel. But before he had finished the second of the Stanze, his patron, as we have seen, died, and his time was henceforth destined to be employed on other works, which, to say the least, interfered greatly with his painting. It was not that, under Leo X., the opportunities afforded Raphael of displaying his artistic resources were less; but that the moral influence of the Papal Court, and of the tone of society, acted prejudicially upon him. The Pope was a man of great learning, and warmly attached to the pursuits of literature. In this he was superior to his predecessor, who wielded the sword more readily than the pen. He may have been equally desirous to raise the dignity of the Papacy, by adding to the grandeur and beauty of Papal Rome. But his ambition was of a more selfish character, and he had not that generosity of temper which delights to recognise transcendant merit in whatever way it may manifest itself. The favourites of Leo must fall in with his views of self-aggrandizement, and of shedding lustre on the house of the Medici. They must be content to regard everything from a classical point of view; they must learn philosophy from Plato, and oratory from Demosthenes and Cicero. If they wrote verses, they must leave their native dialect—'la bella lingua Toscana'—and imitate Virgil. If they were troubled with anxious thoughts, they had better let no one see it, or they would not find a welcome at the Papal Court. There all was mirth, and joviality, and interchange of smart sayings in epigrammatic sentences. The Pope was not only fond of the 'feast of reason,' and the flow of wit; he liked good living, and boon companions; he was passionately fond of field sports, of sumptuous entertainments, and rollicking mirth; consequently he surrounded himself with a swarm of favourites, who were as averse to serious pursuits as himself, and who thought more of the enjoyment of the passing hour, than of their moral duties and responsibilities. Hence, men of lofty and serious purpose were discouraged by the Pontiff. Michel Angelo was several times on the point of quitting Rome, leaving his great works there unfinished, in consequence of the invidious treatment he received at the hands of Leo X. And Ariosto, who came to pay his respects to Leo soon after his accession, and who, on the score of old friendship, was received by him with every demonstration of welcome, very soon quitted the Papal Court in disgust at the hollow insincerity and coldness of the Pope. Never was a greater fallacy, or one more extensively propagated, than the idea that Leo X. was a great promoter of art and letters. His own tastes have been pointed out. His

age was characterized by a love of pleasure and magnificence, to which the highest art was expected to minister. Thus Raphael, instead of being called upon to paint such pictures, and such only as would reflect honour upon their author, not only as an artist, but as a man—such, too, as would have handed down the earthly head of the Western Church to posterity as a man of Apostolic character,—was employed by Leo X. to represent the temporal power of the Papacy, and the fortunes of the Medici; whilst Cardinal da Bibiena, Agostino Chigi, and others, engaged the pencil of the so-called 'divine' Raphael to paint merely human subjects, or such as were furnished by the Greek mythology with its anthropomorphic and sensuous character. In a word, the age of Leo X. was a luxurious and frivolous age, unconscious alike of the dignity of Christianity and of the true sphere of art. What strong tendency there was, was not in favour of an earnest study of nature, but of a revival of classical antiquity; and there is reason to believe that Raphael, had he lived longer, would have been more and more absorbed by this spirit. Indeed, had he not fallen in with the prevailing spirit of the age, he never would have retained his popularity as he did. He preserved his influence at the Papal Court as much by his malleable disposition as by his genius, great as that was; and although we may fairly excuse his acceptance of the appointment of architect of St. Peter's, on Bramante's death, and that of Conservator of Antiquities, which was conferred on him afterwards, by saying, that the example of other artists was all in favour of the simultaneous prosecution of the different branches of art, and that the commands of the Pope were imperative, yet it is difficult to avoid instituting a comparison between Michel Angelo working in secret, at his own expense, and at his own subjects, for the glory of God, and Raphael living in splendour and amassing riches by the practice of his profession, while he ministered to the delight of a pleasure-loving age: a comparison which, it need scarcely be said, is not to the advantage of the latter. If a further insight into the character of the two men be required, let it be sought not in the works of their pencil, but in those of their pen—in the sonnets in which Michel Angelo and Raphael respectively expressed their love—the one to Vittoria Colonna, the other to 'The Fornarina.' The spirit of the one is pure as a breath from heaven; that of the other is redolent of earth. First hear Michel Angelo:—

> La forza di un bel volto al ciel mi sprona
> (Ch' altro in terra non è che mi diletti)
> E vivo ascendo tra gli spirti eletti;
> Grazia ch' ad uom mortal raro si dona.

Si ben col suo Fattor l' opra consuona,
Ch' a lui mi levo per divin concetti;
E quivi 'nformo i pensier tutti e i detti,
Ardendo, amando per gentil persona.
Onde, se mai da due begli occhi il guardo
Torcer non so, conosco in lor la luce.
Che ne mostra la via, ch' a Dio mi guide.
E se nel lume loro acceso io ardo,
Nel nobil foco mio dolce riluce
La gioia che nel cielo eterna ride.

This noble sonnet gives us an insight into the workings of Michel Angelo's heart, and furnishes the key of his artistic inspiration.

Now let us turn to Raphael. The second of his two sonnets in the Oxford Collection runs thus:—

Amor tu men vescati con doi lumi
Dei occhi dov'io mestrugo e face
Da bianca neve e da rose vivace
Da un bel parlar e d' onesti costumi.
Tal che tanto ardo che ne mar ne fiume
Spegner potrian quel focho, ma piace
Poi ch' el mio ardor tanto dibon mi face
C' ardendo ognor più d' arder mi consumi.
Quanto fu dolce al giogo ela catena
De suoi candidi braci al col mio volti
Che sciogliendomi io sento mortal pena.
D' altre cose io non dico che son molti
Che soperchia docezza a morte mena
E però taccio a te ipsensir rivolti.

The reader will note first the difference of style; the pure Italian and correct grammar and spelling of the one, and the Umbrian *patois* and inaccuracies* of the other. He will then mark the transcendental purity of thought in Michel Angelo's, and the glowing fervour of earthly passion in Raphael's sonnet. And then he will be fain to allow that, although Raphael may have had the sweeter temper, and have been the better painter, Michel Angelo was the nobler man, animated by a higher sense of the beautiful, and gifted with more poetic power. Possibly, Raphael might have benefited by a dash of adversity in his cup of life; as it was, he was uniformly

* Line 1, *men vescati* for *m'hai invescato—doi* for *due.* 2, *dei* for *degli—mestrugo e face* for *me struggo e sfaccio.* 3, *vivace* for *vivaci.* 5, *fiume* for *fiumi.* 6, *focho* for *foco.* 7, *Poi ch'el* for *Poi che il—dibon for di ben.* 9, *al giogo ela* for *il giogo e la.* 10, *De . . . braci* for *De' bracci.* 12, *molti* for *molte.* 13, *docezza* for *dolcezza.* 14, *ipsensir* for *i pensier.*

successful; everywhere beloved, and almost universally admired. Such a cup was too sweet for anyone to drink without danger. It was like the life of Ulysses in the island of Calypso, without any regret, or thought of home.

A brief recapitulation of the points touched on, and a few remarks as to the study of art in Oxford, and the best means of making the collection of drawings in the University Galleries available thereto, will conclude this essay. After a short account of the origin of the Collection, and the disposition of the Raphael drawings, a sketch of the artist's life and works has been introduced, particular reference being had to those events upon which the drawings throw any light, and to those great works for which sketches and studies exist in the University Collection. Thus the scattered fragments of the artist's handiwork have been made to illustrate his own course of study, and that which was common to the time in which he lived. With a further view to this object, the reader's attention has been drawn to Raphael's manner of working, and to the preparations which he made for those great works which have established his reputation as the greatest of Christian painters. By examining these, with the help of the illustrations which the University Galleries contain, an insight is obtained into the method pursued by the great painters of the end of the fifteenth, and early part of the sixteenth century, as to the study of nature, the philosophy of art, and the acquisition of technical knowledge, including anatomy, perspective, and the nature of the materials with which the painter has to work. Some of these points are necessarily very briefly touched on; but the subject has been treated in as comprehensive a spirit as space allowed, and with a continual recollection that design is only one part of a painter's art, and that the collection of drawings in the University Galleries, though eminently useful to the student of art, can only supply him with partial information, and should induce him to make himself acquainted with similar collections in this and other countries, and also with the finished compositions of Raphael both in oil-colours and fresco. It is only by a comprehensive method of study of this nature that a just conception can be formed of the capabilities of art. If we start with the notion that the most elaborate study, and most complete means at the disposal of the greatest artist, necessarily produce the most perfect result, we shall be doomed to no slight disappointment; for it is notorious that very few great paintings justify the expectations that have been raised of them, either by the descriptions of amateurs and artists, or by the sight of first sketches for the entire compositions. The study of the finished

works of a great painter compared with his first sketches and studies will teach us to allow for a falling off in some of the chief component parts of the original idea; and a very little reflection will be sufficient to convince us that, the more complicated the means by which the leading idea of a composition is brought before the eyes of the spectator, the greater danger there is of its losing some of its pristine vigour, truth, and beauty. The task of retaining an image before the mind involves an immense mental exertion, and the longer this is sustained, the greater chance there is that the first lines traced on the page of the imagination will become dim, if not wholly obliterated. Hence it is, conversely, that sketches like those which have been described above convey so great a charm to us. In them the artist's mind is brought into immediate contact with our minds, and we delight in tracing the dawn, or maturity of an idea, of which the picture exhibits a more pretending, but a less truthful image. A few pictures, and only a few, retain the freshness of a first idea. One of these is the 'Madonna di S. Sisto,' which, in spite of the thinness of the colouring, and the unideal countenance of the Virgin Mother, brings us nearer to the painter and his subject than any other work of his north of the Alps. There is a grandeur of repose in the child's attitude, which would almost warrant an assumption that Raphael had become acquainted—as he might through drawings—with the 'Theseus' of the Parthenon.

The last subject treated of—namely, the external circumstances under which Raphael's artistic genius developed itself—is one which should not be lost sight of by any one desirous of coming to a just judgment of him as a painter and a man. It contains matter for painful reflection, at the same time that it should lead us to judge charitably. It is always painful to see a nobly-gifted youth with high and heavenly aspirations drawn gradually into the vortex of the world, and absorbed by its business and pleasures; to see his genius clogged with the weight of cares, and chained down to earth by the fetters of the senses, instead of soaring free and uncontaminated into the region of pure and suprasensuous thought on the wings which bore Dante into his *Paradiso*. Viewed in this light, we cannot but lament the circumstances which called Raphael away from his native place and from Florence to Rome; because the atmosphere of the Papal Court was not calculated to preserve the purity of his mind, nor to encourage the independent prosecution of his art. It was, as we have seen, an age unsuited to the development of a new and native growth of literature and art, suited to Christian times and modes of thought. All this should make us judge charitably of Raphael

as an artist. It is difficult to see how he could have avoided falling into the habits of thought which then prevailed. Had he set up a severer standard, he would not have met with that incense of admiration which to most painters is as the breath of their nostrils. He did not paint for posterity, because he did not imagine that the opinion of posterity would be better worth having than that of the age he lived in. Had he been unambitious, regardless of the approbation of his contemporaries, rigidly resolved to carry out his own ideal of art, a delighter in emaciated forms of saints and figures of the Virgin, in which no trace of earthly affection, but only the sublimated expression of heavenly meekness and purity could be traced; had he taken as much pains to find out what cloaks and coats the fishermen of Galilee wore as he did to ascertain the form and disposition of Greek draperies; had he despised anatomical knowledge, and the representation of lusty life, with its outward signs of rounded limbs, and easy motion, and the mantling glow of health upon the cheek, he might have been a more self-denying and estimable painter, but he would not have been Raphael. One of the first requirements in a great artist is, that he must follow his nature. The higher and nobler that nature is, the greater artist he is likely to be; and he must be looked upon as equally responsible with other men for the habits which he contracts, and the principles which he forms in early youth; but he can never succeed if he attempt to thwart and check his inclinations once matured, or to graft upon his natural gifts qualities which belong to a different temperament and frame of mind. Raphael's natural disposition led him to represent the tender domestic affections, and in that domain he reigns supreme. He was early familiarised with Platonic philosophy, and seems to have taken the model of the Greek philosopher as the type of human nature in its most exalted form. These influences never deserted him. They manifest themselves in the last Holy Family he ever painted, and in the cartoons for the tapestries in the Sistine Chapel. We should be glad to see in his later frescoes more of the spirit which shows itself in 'The Disputa;' but this could not be. 'The Disputa' is like an author's first work. It exhibits less art, but contains infinitely more thought, and shows more labour of love. Fifteen years of study, and thought, and assimilation of other's ideas, went to make the 'Disputa' what it is. The 'School of Athens,' too, gives the results of years of thought and training, acting upon a congenial disposition. In the other frescoes we trace the influences of the day, variously modifying the treatment of the subjects; and during the last years of the artist's life we observe an increasing sense

of animal beauty, of the enjoyment of life, and of the perfection of form. If we may fairly judge of an artist's character by that of his works, we cannot but remark the circumstance of a great change having taken place in Raphael between the execution of 'The Disputa,' and that of the frescoes in the Farnesina and Cardinal da Bibiena's bath-room. Thus Raphael is a disappointment to the moralist. Instead of beginning with the common vices of youth, and gradually, or all at once, like Polemon, putting them off, and addicting himself to stern philosophy, he became more and more engrossed by pleasure and objects of sense as he grew older.

On the other hand, it appears like ingratitude to quarrel with the circumstances which called forth the genius of the greatest of all Italian painters. After all that can be said, his works remain, stamped with the approbation of near three centuries and a-half, and awakening, even in their faded splendour, our delight and admiration. Common sense suggests that we must take him as he is, with his strength and his weakness, with the calm repose of his youth, and the ambitious strivings of his manhood—a being made up of earthly passions and spiritual longings, conscious of a higher destiny at the time that he drained the cup of life to the dregs, and mixing up two antagonistic principles, each of which he felt intensely,—the spirit of classical antiquity, and the spirit of Roman, not Catholic, Christianity. Common justice will constrain us to allow that, although not wholly pure in his life, he was never accused of profligacy, and *that*, too, in a day when profligacy was the rule of society, and not the exception. When cardinals and popes set the example of laxity and licentiousness of conduct, it was not to be expected that a high tone of morals should prevail among artists. Let both classes receive their due from a retrospective posterity, and the luxurious ecclesiastics would be well-nigh buried before a stone touched Raphael and his Fornarina.

His early death has been used to point many a moral, generally harping on the same string, but never, I believe, to illustrate the truth which needs constantly to be impressed not only on artists, but on authors, on statesmen, on all who live and work under a high degree of intellectual pressure,—that 'the mind wears out the sheath,' and that little ailments speedily bring down to the grave the constitution weakened by incessant mental activity. Yet this is the truth which a calm historical inquiry, following probability where certainty fails, will elicit from the circumstances of Raphael's death.

I would now say a few words on the study of art in Oxford, and the way in which the Raphael drawings may be made

conducive thereto. Without an attempt at giving 'professional' education in art, our universities may fairly be supposed to recognise a knowledge of the principles and results of art as a part of an English gentleman's education. Otherwise, now that education in art is becoming so common among the middle classes, the upper classes, and those who are most distinguished by intellectual cultivation, will be placed, relatively, in a disadvantageous position. And this is not a mere matter of mental culture, affecting only the individual. It is a matter of state policy to train up our future legislators and patrons of art to an intelligent appreciation of those great works, the possession of which confers honour upon a nation. Viewed merely from a commercial point of view, it is highly desirable that our artists should have access to the best specimens of design which exist; that they should be able to profit by the instruction derived from the great Italian masters, and should bring to their study of nature a feeling borrowed from sunnier climes and a more gifted age. If our manufacturers are to compete, with a fair chance of success, with our continental neighbours, it is clear that they must have equal advantages, and as great a facility of obtaining good designs. This is pretty generally acknowledged, and we owe our schools of design throughout the country to it. But the same activity has not been displayed by the 'privileged' classes,—*i.e.* in this case, those who can afford to give their sons an university education. They have not felt the same pressure of competition. They have been tormented by no fears of their landed estates and houses flying across the channel, or of their solid mental acquirements becoming superseded by newer inventions. Hence, on matters connected with art, they evince a lamentable apathy and ignorance. This has been sufficiently exposed in the *Report of the Committee appointed by the House of Commons to enquire into the Management of our National Gallery*,* and in the various articles which have appeared from time to time in our leading journals. Considering the power vested in the hands of the trustees (who were formerly the Lords of the Treasury, with one or two other official persons), and the importance of the trust committed to them, it does seem very desirable that the class from which they are taken should have a fair chance given them of qualifying themselves for the discharge of their duties. If one good course of lectures were given annually at each of our old universities, of such a nature as to draw the attention of the hearers to the

* Printed by order of the House of Commons, 4th August, 1853.

principal points connected with the cultivation of art,—embracing the theory of art, or what is called, in Germany, the æsthetic part, the history of art, artists, and their works, and the best method of training the mind, eye, and hand to the appreciation and imitation of true greatness, pointing out to young students subjects for designs from history and poetry, to amateurs and critics pieces of just criticism contained in the works of ancient and modern writers;—the *élite* of the nation, educated in these ancient seats of learning, the future patrons of art, and trustees of our national collections, would leave the banks of the Isis and Cam better qualified to take part in discussions, and to decide on matters of art. They would be enabled to form a just conception of the nature of each of the different branches of the Fine Arts, and, consequently a correct estimate as to what should be required, both of the artist and of the public, on whose patronage the latter is dependent. Each wealthy and well-instructed patron of the Fine Arts who left the universities would thus carry into the country the principles of a true taste, and the means of extending them. And in each provincial town and mechanics' institute the same principles might, under judicious patronage, be taught; and thus a knowledge of the resources and capabilities of art would take the place of the ignorance which now prevails. The interests of art would, by these means, be effectually promoted, and its profession liberalised; for not only would the natural patrons of art be better enabled to appreciate merit, but their intelligent interest in the welfare of schools of art throughout the country would help to counterbalance the deficiencies of an education too technical and professional, such as that which artists too commonly receive. In advocating these views nearly three years ago, I suggested a plan by which it appeared to me that they might be carried into effect. Feeling the small demand that there is at the old universities for information in matters of art, and thinking it better, at present, that the residents at Oxford and Cambridge should continue to devote their principal attention to the studies which form a recognised part of academic education,—being aware, moreover, that the largest number of professional students will always be found in London, and that there must be many of these who would highly value the opportunity of attending such lectures as I have described,—I suggested that a professor should be appointed by Government to give one course of lectures annually, in London, and also in the two universities, and that every facility of foreign travel and study at home should be afforded him, which should make his lectures adequate to the wants both of professional students

and amateurs. I now venture to repeat the same suggestion, in the hope that it may lead to some public recognition of the want above indicated, and to effectual means being taken to provide for it.

If only a few of the young men of rank and fortune who come to Oxford are induced to pay attention to the study of art, much good will be effected. Experience teaches us that a correct taste in these matters is no common gift, and it will be useless to expect every 'Oxford graduate' to turn out a Ruskin. Even if those who have no taste learn to respect those who have, and to recognise their pursuits as a no less fit employment for an English gentleman than the sports of the field, not a little good will have been done by the professor. A review of the names connected, within the last fifteen years, with the pursuit of the fine arts will show that Christchurch has not sent out Mr. Ruskin alone, but others, distinguished as amateurs, as artists and intelligent patrons of art. The names of Lord Elcho, Charles Newton, John Leslie, and William Boulton—who unhappily did not live to realize the promise that he gave,—all of whom were members of the same college, are sufficiently well known in the artistic world. It is particularly desirable that men of independent fortune should take up the study of art, because that study can only be followed systematically by persons who have abundant means, or who pursue it as a profession; and many of the latter are discouraged by the difficulties which beset the rising artist—the jealousy of the profession, the want of judicious patronage, &c.—considerations from which men of fortune are exempt. Let it, however, be clearly ascertained that they have a decided talent; if not, let them content themselves with being able to appreciate the *results* of art, and let them not waste the time which might be devoted to useful objects in vain attempts to become great painters. The want of success of so many dabblers in art proves that mediocrity is no more conceded to painters than to poets.

If any one desire to know how great a difference really exists between one man's powers and another's, let him copy one drawing of a really great artist, or even a few lines of it. He will see that even in those lines which seem to be accidental, the hand of the master was guided by the most intense feeling and the most unerring skill. Some of the Raphael drawings in the University Galleries are very slight; but the power they possess of conveying an idea is not slight. The master's mind speaks in every curve, in every dot. Persons unacquainted with the subject wonder how judges can pronounce so confidently with respect to the genuineness of a

drawing. As long as a drawing be good enough for Raphael, they cannot understand any one's doubting that he was the author of it. Yet the analogy of hand-writing might enable them to understand this. As there are persons who can detect with unerring accuracy a forged signature, and can frequently give reasons for their decision which anyone can understand, so there are artists and connoisseurs who have studied a painter's hand-writing, *i.e.* his *touch*, so minutely, as to be able to pronounce with certainty whether a drawing professing to be by him be a forgery or not. In many cases they can assign reasons for this, but in others they are obliged to follow a kind of instinct, the result of much careful examination, without, however, being able to state positively the grounds of their opinion. A long apprenticeship is necessary to the acquisition of such a power of discrimination; but a very little attention to the subject will enable the student to trace the development of Raphael's powers, and render him familiar with some of the chief subjects he has treated, and his mode of treating them.

In order to make the collection of drawings in the University Galleries as useful as it admits of being made, several things are to be desired. The drawings would be seen much better if they were arranged according to the different periods of the master, and their study would be made more easy and profitable if engravings of Raphael's chief works were hung over the drawings, as they are in the Wicar Gallery, at Lille. Lastly, additional drawings of masters of different schools would give great value to those which the University possesses. Drawings by Pietro Perugino and D. Ghirlandajo would acquire an additional interest by being placed side by side with those of their great pupils. For the acquisition of these and similar treasures Oxford must look to the munificence of collectors who, like Lord Ellesmere and Mr. Chambers Hall, are content that a portion or the whole of their collection should pass in their lifetime to enrich the gallery of a great national institution, or who prefer to consign by bequest to the safe keeping of a public and responsible body the works of art in which their interest can only terminate with their life.

G. B.

THE LAND SYSTEM OF IRELAND.

TWELVE years have passed since Sir Robert Peel appointed a Commission to inquire into 'the state of the tenure and occupation of land in Ireland.' Recent events had probably satisfied him that the causes of the chronic discontent and poverty of that country had been misinterpreted, and that the true remedies for them had yet to be discovered. The evil had been attributed to the exclusion of the Roman Catholics of Ireland from Parliament and from municipal privileges, and to the opulence of the Irish Church Establishment; and yet it had survived these supposed provocatives. Nay, though Roman Catholics were numerous in the House of Commons, and had obtained an ascendency in Irish corporations, and though the Anglican clergy of Ireland had lost twenty-five per cent. of their incomes, it now showed great and peculiar vigour. Within the preceding eight months, a single individual had condensed the elements of discontent into portentous forms, and had banded together those multitudinous assemblages which were known by the name of 'monster meetings,' and to which, wherever they were held, every parish within two days' journey sent its regular levy. Could mere dislike of the English name—the result of political wrongs now redressed—could the hope of the restoration of a parliament which had ever oppressed the Roman Catholics of Ireland—could the arts of a demagogue, acting upon excitable imaginations, have moulded together these formidable arrays? Was it not plain that had the peasantry who formed them been engaged in profitable employment—had they been attached to the soil by self-interest—they would not have allowed mere reminiscences thus to move them? And while this was the insecure state of the agricultural lower classes, were the upper ranks connected with the soil contented or wealthy? On the contrary, Parliament had recently been unable to extend to them the income-tax; they were notoriously embarrassed in many instances; they swelled the

ranks of place-seekers, and, as a body, they did not much engage in agriculture. And yet this class had hitherto enjoyed almost all the power and patronage within their country. They were generally Protestants of the Church of England; they had once been the overpaid garrison of England in Ireland with privileges they never should have possessed; and though, happily, these had vanished, they had nothing to complain of from the Legislature. Why, then, were they unprosperous? Sir Robert Peel was led to believe that the distempers of Ireland were material, and were to be found in the disorganisation of its land-system, and, resolved to explore, and, as far as possible, to heal them, he set on foot the well-known 'Devon Commission.'

The Commissioners spent about fifteen months in the inquiry. During that time they visited every county of that land, whose 'goodlye and commodious soyle' had charmed Spenser, and, two hundred years afterwards, had been preferred by Arthur Young to that of England. The limestone stratum, which forms the chief subsoil of Ireland, is generally, throughout the breadth of the country, covered with a turf of exuberant verdure. The hills which rise from this fair surface, except in the highlands of Kerry, are of mild declivity, and invite cultivation, and in their short and easy ranges nowhere present a barrier to civilization. A broad belt of turf-mosses intersects the country from east to west, and, in the present state of agriculture, is probably irreclaimable; but it yields fuel and manure of much value. The coast has the finest harbours in Great Britain, to which, from every side, descends a variety of rivers, generally navigable, and everywhere affording facilities of water-carriage. The soil, traversed at short intervals by these streams, and saturated with frequent rains, brought up by the west winds, requires drainage in many places, but is generally kind and fertile. In 1844, as in 1776, when it was visited by Arthur Young, Ireland had all the natural requisites of agricultural prosperity; a genial soil, a climate moist, indeed, compared with that of Kent, but not more moist than that of Devon, and every appliance for the internal and the foreign transport of the products of husbandry.

What, then, in 1844, was the state of the land-system of Ireland? The Commissioners must have noticed that its principal cities are on the sea-coast, and, therefore, that the chief markets for its agricultural produce are withdrawn from the interior. Ireland did not then possess a single inland town of twenty thousand inhabitants, and many of its chief inland towns remain squalid villages, conspicuous only for their gaols, poor-houses, and barracks. And of the cities which rise along

its shores, and which form *entrepôts* for its exports and imports, Belfast alone can be called a seat of manufacture. With this exception, Ireland has none of those centres of industrial energy which absorb so much of the labouring population of Great Britain, and which indirectly speed its agricultural prosperity. Nor has it one of those gay resorts of provincial opulence which form so peculiar a characteristic of England, and which enrich the adjacent country by their demand for its produce. How the land-system of Ireland must have suffered from the want of a home-market for a large amount of its produce, must have been obvious to the Commissioners. But the form of that system, as might have been supposed, was to be seen impressed upon the soil. As they passed through those fertile counties, every day's journey showed them, contrasting strangely with the demesnes of the gentry, the pastures of graziers, and the corn-fields of more extensive farmers, and hemming them in on every side, uncouth and squalid cottier-dwellings, clustered along the road-sides, or grouped among the fields, or gathered into hamlets, whose rude inhabitants divided the country far and near into narrow and ill-cultivated holdings. The breadth of land occupied by these small cottier-farms, which grew nothing but potatoes, oats, and the coarsest natural grasses, was evidently greater than that held by a better class of agriculturists; and a glance at the seats and demesnes of the gentry, and the homesteads and lands of the larger farmers, revealed a state of wealth and cultivation far behind that of Great Britain. Here and there might be seen ancient parks, spreading out into breadths of verdure, overshadowed by oaks and elms, or belted by distant woods, and encircling grey manor-houses which showed a long and a careful ownership. Sometimes the eye met those trim ranges of turnip and wheat fields, of clover and meadow, studded with flocks and herds, which gladden the sight in the Lothians or in Lincolnshire. But, in general, the demesnes and mansions of the aristocracy, though extensive and of large structure, looked comfortless and neglected; and the lands held by the larger class of farmers seemed ill-drained, scantily and poorly tilled, and grazed by a stunted and inferior breed of stock. The aspect of the soil, where it had been subjected to cultivation, seemed generally worn and exhausted. And yet, where it had been unbroken, and left to its natural sod, it showed in the richness of its verdure, and the size and fatness of the cattle which it reared, clear proofs of its natural fertility. In short, the surface of Ireland at this time, in its multiplicity of cottier-holdings, its neglected and ill-cultivated farms, and its general appearance of agricultural backwardness,

showed plainly that the two great evils of its land-system were an overwhelming population fastened as cottiers upon the soil, and a deficiency of farming capital to call its resources into action.

The numerous witnesses examined by the Commissioners, and the statistical evidence they obtained and published, gave proof of the existence of these and other evils. The aggregation of multitudes upon the soil, without other means of employment, naturally caused a low rate of wages among labourers; a competition for holding land, which raised the rent of it to an improper height, and proportionally reduced the profits of agriculture; and a minute subdivision of holdings, which prevented real farming within their limits, and checked real farming everywhere. But it was made worse by the prevalence of mutual mistrust between the owners and the occupiers of the land, betraying itself in acts of oppression on the one side, and in occasional atrocities on the other, and often making the relation of landlord and tenant jarring and unkindly. And the repulsion of capital from agriculture, resulting from these causes, was aggravated by the modes of the occupation of the soil and by the embarrassment of the landed proprietary, which forbade the existence of a secure and profitable tenure. In the north of Ireland, indeed, a custom called 'tenant right' existed, which, to quote the words of the Commissioners, 'enabled the tenant, though without a lease, to sell the bare privilege of occupancy, or possession of his farm, without any visible sign of improvement having been made by him, at from ten to sixteen, up to twenty, or even forty years' purchase of the rent.' But this custom, though it gave a certainty of property in the holding, appears to have made the landlords careless about their tenantry, and the tenantry indolent and unimproving, since it gave them, 'without any exertion, an apparent property or security, by means of which they were enabled to incur future incumbrances, in order to avoid present inconvenience.' In the other provinces of Ireland there was every obstacle to a proper system of tenure. Almost everywhere a gradation of mesne owners was interposed between the landlord in fee and the occupying tenant, who was thus made liable to distress and ejectment for non-payment of rents for which he never contracted, and the owners of which perhaps he never saw. This indefinite liability to a succession of owners who 'frequently overlaid the soil six or seven deep,' necessarily made the occupancy of land distasteful to the improving and the wealthy. Who would lay out money in farm-buildings, in drainage, in modes of tillage which required time to replace their cost, or in propagating

better breeds of sheep and cattle, when the sword of Damocles hung over his head? The general embarrassment of the landlords superadded other mischiefs. Leases were seldom given in a state of society where rent was rising unnaturally, and, if given, were sometimes set aside by the creditors of those who granted them. A large portion of the soil of Ireland was under the control of the Court of Chancery, in the administration of indebted estates, and was thus withheld from profitable cultivation. These estates, indeed, were generally distinguishable amongst all others for the degradation of the cottiers who swarmed over them, and for their ruined and hopeless aspect. Throughout the country the expense of building homesteads and farm-buildings, of draining and fencing, of adding to the soil what may be termed its fixed capital, which in England is always borne by the landlord, was thrown upon the tenant. And when any of these improvements were made, and incorporated with the soil, the common law of England, neutralised in that country by the difference of the custom, appropriated them to the landlord without any compensation. And yet it is certain that, compared with the capital employed in cultivating the soil, the rent of land in Ireland was, in 1844, higher than that of England. For these reasons it was plain that, at this period, Ireland, with its unstable tenures, its rack-rents, its agrarian crimes, and its customs with regard to capital sunk in improvements, naturally was avoided by the better class of farmers.

Such, then, in 1844, was the land-system of Ireland: a fertile soil, incumbered by hungry swarms, who starved on its surface, or half cultivated by a race of farmers deprived of their just profits, and often subjected to middlemen, and engrossed by a bankrupt feudalism, which absorbed its wealth, and kept it bound in fetters destructive of its improvement. And this social disorganization was made more incurable by the continuous conflict of race and of sect raging on its soil, and often breaking out into crime. Contemporary statistics show that this is not an exaggerated picture. Of the twenty million eight hundred thousand acres which form the soil of Ireland, it was calculated that at this period six million and two hundred thousand were out of cultivation, of which two millions and a half only were unimprovable, leaving a balance of nearly four millions of acres capable of being reclaimed. The fourteen millions and a half of acres subject to cultivation were parcelled out among nine hundred and thirty thousand holdings, giving an average of somewhat more than fifteen acres to each farm. Of these holdings more than five hundred thousand were under ten acres each, a class of cottier farm which

experience has shown to be most injurious to a country, while those of from fifty acres upwards, which form the fitting areas for agricultural skill and the outlay of capital, scarcely exceeded sixty-eight thousand in number. This latter class, too, in many instances, was composed of grazing, not tillage, farms, and rarely could bear a comparison with its kindred class in England or Scotland. The methods of husbandry pursued upon the farms that were in tillage were threefold, and regulated by the quantity of land they occupied. On holdings under one acre the only crop was the potato; on those of two or two and a half acres, potatoes and oats in succession; on those above this size up to farms of a considerable extent, potatoes and grain—either oats or wheat—on about three-sevenths of the acreage, and poor natural grasses upon the remaining four-sevenths. The farm-buildings were 'insufficient even for the actual low state of tillage,' and would have been more conspicuously so 'if the more profitable class of cultivation connected with house-feeding' were practised. The hovels occupied by the cottiers were 'miserable, and yet, in many cases, paid a rent exceeding fifty per cent. per annum on their cost.' Thus real agriculture upon farms of a sufficient area was extremely rare. And when this was the state of the base, what was that of the apex of society? The rental of Ireland had been calculated at about twelve and a half millions of pounds sterling. Of this sum, estates yielding about six hundred thousand pounds were under the control of the Equity Courts, the greater number of them in deep embarrassment; and subsequent events have proved how many more, even then, were beyond redemption. As a fitting commentary upon this state of things, the Commissioners inform us that, in the year 1844, a year remarkable for its excellent harvest and general prosperity, there were a thousand instances of agrarian crime in Ireland, that is, of a species of crime unknown in the rest of Great Britain, and arising from the passions generated in the relations of Irish landlords and tenants.

Scarcely had the Commissioners published their Report, when the destruction of the potato crop of Ireland in the years 1845 and 1846 overthrew the land-system they had investigated and described. They, whose hearts sank within them as they witnessed the effects of this mysterious visitation, the uprooting from the soil of the cottier population, who crowded into the poor-houses hitherto deserted, or hurried across the Atlantic, the desolation of broad tracts of land from which these swarms had disappeared, and which wore the aspect of ruined and wasted solitudes,—the outburst, in abortive rebellion and in multiplied agrarian outrages, of the smoulder-

ing discords of Irish landlords and tenants, exasperated by want and made hopeless by despair,—the frequent evictions, and disappearance of mesne landlords, sinking with their pauperised cottiers,—the sudden sweeping into the Equity Courts of estates representing a rental of one million and six hundred thousand pounds, and the forced and enormous transfer of landed property occasioned by the Incumbered Estates Court, and often resembling a process of confiscation, probably were unaware they were so near a better order of things. In the year 1849, when the old land-system of Ireland was finally dissolved, and before the elements thus scattered abroad had acquired a new form, few could anticipate that, by the year 1855, they would have moulded themselves into a hopeful system, and that the rude shocks of famine would have preluded the emancipation of the soil and the regeneration of Irish agriculture. And yet it cannot be doubted that the destruction of the potato crop, combined with a course of legislation which wisely drew good from its results and shaped them to beneficial ends, has done this great work. The loss of that precarious root which alone made their holding land possible, and the working of the Poor Law of 1847, which refuses relief to any person holding more than a quarter of an acre of land, and charges the landlord with all the poor-rate upon farms under four pounds in value, have to a great extent eased the land of its cottier population. The vacuum caused by this removal has gradually been filled by real farmers, and, as this area was usually in a most exhausted state, divided into miserable patches, and without farm buildings or other appliances for agriculture, its owners were encouraged to improve it by an Act of 1848, authorizing advances to landed proprietors for land improvement. The fetters which the custom of interposing middlemen between the owners in fee and the occupiers of the soil had flung over the land, and which kept it bound in an antiquated feudalism, were greatly relaxed by the famine, and were still further weakened by an Act of 1849, intituled the 'Renewable Leasehold Conversion Act,' which enables the mesne owner to emancipate himself, and therefore his tenants, from his superior, by commuting his rent for a portion of his holding. This statute forbids the creation in future of these mischievous tenures, and thus, it is to be hoped, their final extinction, with that of their pernicious effects, is not distant. But legislation has been most useful in producing the Incumbered Estates Act.

If the famine gave the finishing stroke to those ruined proprietors who engrossed so much of the soil of Ireland, to the detriment of its agriculture, it is to this measure that its speedy

emancipation must be attributed. Had it not become law, about one-sixth of the land of the country would have been locked up in the Equity Courts, that is, deprived of a visible owner, withdrawn for years from real cultivation, incapable of being let on leases beyond seven years in duration, and made the refuge of the lowest species of tenantry. It has doubtless been the most efficient human agent for freeing the soil of Ireland for a healthier land-system. Some notion may be formed of its operations, when we state, that it has already brought landed property, worth thirty millions sterling, within its sphere. Finally, the great simplification of the practice of the Court of Chancery in Ireland, since 1850, has not been without its effects upon changing its land-system.

The result of this great social revolution is already displaying itself upon the soil of Ireland. The cottier farms, except, perhaps, in the north, have become very few. A remarkable improvement is evident in the husbandry of larger farms. The cultivation of the turnip, and its natural consequence,—the fattening of cattle,—is becoming more frequent. In every county the traveller notices that farm-buildings are being erected, and better homesteads rising around. The breeds of sheep and of cattle are larger and fatter than they were, and, in many places, spread over rich pastures, formerly split up into squalid cottier holdings. Many thousand acres have been drained since 1844, and are now fertile oat-land and meadow. Within the last twelve years, the railway system of Ireland has been created, and has brought the best markets for its produce closer to its producers. Above all, a class of small proprietors in fee has been formed out of the wrecks of the old landlords, and their newly-built dwellings greet the sight in every county. The statistical tables prepared by Government verify these statements. The number of farms in Ireland, at the close of the year 1854, had fallen to five hundred and ninety thousand, or not much over a half of those existing in 1841. Of these, the farms exceeding thirty acres in area had risen to the number of one hundred and fifty-four thousand. The extent of land cultivated, compared with that of 1841, appears to show an increase of one million of acres; but we suspect that here there is some mistake. The extinction of the cottier farms is further evidenced by the census returns, which show that the population of Ireland, from 1841 to 1851, lost two million of its numbers. That these have ultimately been absorbed by emigration, is proved by the fact, that from 1847 to 1854, two hundred and fifty thousand persons annually left the Irish shores, and that, while in 1849 relief was given to two million and forty-three

thousand souls, this portentous multitude, in 1855, had fallen to fifty-seven thousand. The gradual conversion of the land into larger farms, and a better state of cultivation, appears from the returns of Irish agricultural produce. In 1847, the cereal produce of Ireland was estimated at sixteen million two hundred and fifty thousand quarters, and that of its roots and vegetables at eight million eight hundred thousand tons; while the corresponding crops of 1855 are fourteen million one hundred and eighty thousand quarters, and eleven million and thirty-eight thousand tons. These figures show a small decline in the crops produced, but prove the substitution, to a large extent, of a fertilising for an exhausting crop, the clear proof of a better land-system. But the most remarkable testimony to improvement appears in contrasting the value of the live stock of 1841—which was calculated as worth nineteen million four hundred thousand pounds—with that of 1855, which, at the same rates, was estimated at thirty-three million and a half. No fact can more satisfactorily establish the great and beneficial change of the land system of Ireland; a revolution from cottier farms, growing exhausting crops, and with few cattle to manure them, to substantial farms, cultivated on a proper rotation of crops, and well supplied with live stock. And although the rent of land in 1855 is, perhaps, as high as it was in 1841, it has not risen in proportion with this improvement, which shows how the competition for land has diminished. Lastly, the Incumbered Estates Court, in the six years from 1849 to 1855, has effected the sale and transfer of seventeen millions' worth of Irish land, which, hitherto, had practically been withdrawn from improvement. This enormous area has been distributed into upwards of eight thousand lots, and, with very few exceptions, has been purchased by Irish capitalists, who will henceforth form a resident proprietary. And, up to the 1st of January, 1856, about an equal amount of land remained to sell, and probably will be acquired by the same class of purchasers.

But amidst these great and visible proofs of the improvement of the Irish land system, there remain traces of its old characteristics. Agrarian crime, though diminished, is not extinct, and, in the current year, compared with 1855, we fear, is increasing. The animosity of race and sect, which, more or less, embitters every social relation in Ireland, but which has been peculiarly grievous in that of its landlords and tenants, still survives. In three of the four provinces of Ireland, the landed proprietors are generally Protestant and of British origin, and the tenantry are principally Irish and Roman Catholic; and between these classes there is yet a

painful line of demarcation. We doubt whether the change wrought by the Incumbered Estates Court has made much difference in this classification; it is evident that the elements which form the landed classes of Ireland are still unkindly mixed,—antagonistic in race and creed. All through the east, west, and south of Ireland, the tenantry, in the year 1852, united with their priests to vote against their landlords. They who, in that year, saw the long lines of electors, amid the exultation of the surrounding crowds, and, in spite of threats of dispossession and coercion, follow their clergy to the poll and vote against their landlords, and who reflected upon this unnatural severance, must have felt that the land-system of Ireland is still faulty. And as the occupiers of the Irish soil have increased in wealth, they have organised an agitation for a change of the law with respect to tenants' outlays in improvements. One section of this party seeks to enlarge the tenant's term beyond its stipulated length, until, by a receipt of the profits of the land, he shall have obtained a return for what he may have expended. Another insists, that at the expiration of his term, he shall be enabled to charge his landlord with the value of all improvements of what kind soever. Thus, the liberation of the Irish soil for a better mode of culture, and the great and beneficial change which the last few years have witnessed, have not extinguished all the old evils, and have given birth to a novel form of discontent. We are thus led to investigate the causes of the old land-system of Ireland, and to consider whether any of them remain at work, and may be checked or neutralised.

That system, we think, may primarily be attributed to the peculiar manner in which, in the seventeenth century, the land of Ireland was planted with Scotch and English settlers, and to the barbarous legislation which, from 1700 to 1779, oppressed the large majority, and impoverished all classes of its people. The history of Ireland, from the days of Elizabeth to those of Anne, is that of successive inroads of British colonists upon the Irish nation, everywhere obtaining a mastery over the soil and the natives, everywhere sowing abroad that discord which a conquered nation, still left in masses upon the soil, feels against conquerors of a different race, language, and religion, but nowhere, except in one province, forming the bulk of the people. During this period, the land of Ireland was in a continual state of confiscation, alternately changing hands as the English or Irish interests prevailed; and it left Ulster almost exclusively in the possession of Protestants of the British race. But while, at its close, after strange vicissitudes of war, and savage atrocities

on both sides, the grandsons of Elizabeth's courtiers and of James's undertakers, the offspring of Cromwell's Ironsides, and the troopers of King William, had won the ownership of almost all Leinster, Munster, and Connaught, the ancient race retained the actual occupation. Thus, by the year 1700, two distinct nations held three-fourths of the soil of Ireland; set in the closest relation,—that of landlord and tenant,—but arrayed each against the other by every feeling which the pride of victory, the bitterness of defeat, the memories of confiscation, the hostility of race, and the antipathy of sect could engender. The dominant race, spread like a garrison over the country, treated the subject race like predial slaves. They gave them the nickname of the Irish enemy. They exacted their rents from them like forced contributions. They despised any of their own caste who intermarried with a native, and looked upon themselves as foreigners in a strange country, amid a hostile people. Swift, in one of his bitter moods, has portrayed their arrogant demeanour, their coarse pride, and their rapacity towards their dependents. The conquered race lay in swarms upon the soil, hopeless and despised, or cherishing anticipations of revenge. Some of their chiefs left the land, and gained renown in the armies of France, of Austria, and even of the Czar. But the vast majority clung to the soil, reminded by Swift that they were 'hewers of wood and drawers of water,' by even the gentle Berkeley 'that they were to the English race what the barbarians were to the colonists of Rome,' and by their landlords in every parish that they were born to vassalage.

This state of things was, undoubtedly, mitigated by degrees. The half-military landlords of the days of Swift degenerated into a squirearchy, and the conquered race became an agricultural peasantry. But the chasm in the relations of Irish landlords and tenants which conquest had made was never firmly reunited. The instincts and feelings, the hopes and fears, of the two classes remained the same. The Irish landlords never gained the regard of their tenants, and the tenants never obtained the respect of their landlords. The kindly intercourse which adorns this relation in Great Britain, has never been known in three-fourths of Ireland. The squires of this region, to this hour, generally treat their tenantry as mere payers of rent, who cultivate their estates, but dislike them in their hearts; who still call their race and faith by an opprobrious name; who, at every election, are certain to vote against them, and who, had they but the opportunity, would gladly drive them from the soil. The tenants, on their part, still consider their landlords as foreigners, and often as intruders—still

avoid general association with them, and probably retain the feelings which, in the days of Arthur Young, made the chiefs of many a broken clan preserve the title-deeds of the lands from which their forefathers had been uprooted, in anticipation of the hour when 'Ireland should again be Irish,' and they should repossess their ancient seats.

This chronic state of material association and moral antagonism between the landlords and tenants of three-fourths of Ireland has marked itself by occasional outbursts of open violence, and by the more dangerous atrocities of agrarian crime. On almost every occasion when Great Britain has been threatened by a foreign enemy, and when, therefore, the British landlords of Leinster, Munster, and Connaught have been left without military protection, the tenantry of this district has risen against the proprietary, or at least has run into excesses of outrage. And when Great Britain is strong, and a powerful force is in Ireland, this war of classes betrays itself in those cruel assassinations of Irish landlords and agents, which, though committed in the open day, and within sight of many, too often escape detection and punishment. It has been ascertained that these foul deeds are the fruit of a regular organization of crime, spread abroad throughout the country, with its duly-elected staff of judges, to determine the amount of landlord oppression which shall justify assassination, with its hired agents for murder, and with its paid instruments to baffle conviction and ensure escape. The institution of this Irish Vehm-right, the result of the antipathy between Irish landlords and tenants, is the sad heritage of the confiscations we have referred to. It has of course inflicted the greatest evils upon the land-system of Ireland, checking improvement, driving landlords abroad, and causing retaliating oppression. At present it is quiescent, but, we fear, has not been dissolved. Until the hostility of class from which it arises shall have vanished, there is every likelihood that its effects will reappear.

It is probable, however, that before this the bloody characters of repeated confiscations would have been effaced, that the hostile races planted upon the Irish soil in the relation to landlord and tenant would have coalesced into a nation, and that the land-system of Ireland would long ago have been of a very different character, had it not been for the cruel laws which, during the first eighty years of the last century, were the curse of the Irish nation. These laws directly caused the old land-system of Ireland, with its embarrassed proprietary, its middleman tenures, and its cottier tenantry, and indirectly perpetuated the hostility of race and sect. They had a four-

fold object. It was thought necessary by the British colonists of Ireland to seek to keep asunder the two nations then in Ireland for ever, and accordingly the intermarriage of Protestants and Roman Catholics was prohibited. It was thought necessary to debar the Irish or Roman Catholic nation, which numbered three-fourths of the people, from acquiring real property, and from enjoying whatever real property remained to them. Hence, every Roman Catholic was prevented from gaining a larger interest in lands than a lease for thirty-one years, at a rack-rent. The freehold estates then belonging to Roman Catholics were made to gavel among the heirs of the owner, if of the proscribed faith, and even their shares were forfeited unless they conformed within six months. But any son of a Roman Catholic proprietor, even during the life of his father, by changing his religion, was enabled to obtain the inheritance; a law, as has been observed, calculated to ruin any family. It was thought necessary to deprive the Irish nation of the means of fortune open to intelligence, and hence the education of Roman Catholics was forbidden, and every office of power and trust was sealed against them.

Lastly, in consideration of this supremacy over the Irish nation, the British settlers in Ireland contracted to place their country in commercial bondage to Great Britain. The woollen manufactures of Ireland, which hitherto had flourished, were destroyed by prohibitory duties upon Irish exports. All merchants in Ireland were excluded from the monopolies which then formed the foreign trade of Great Britain; and Irish ship-owners were excepted from the Navigation Acts which at that time confined the coasting, and colonial, and a great part of the foreign trade of Great Britain to British vessels. When, on the 22nd of February, 1703, Sir Theobald Butler, the first Irish lawyer of his day, and, in those evil times, the last avowed champion of Roman Catholic rights, rose at the bar of the Irish House of Commons, and, in pathetic language, besought that conclave of foreign zealots to spare his race from laws 'which were against the laws of God and man, and against the rules of reason and justice—which tended to make children become undutiful, and to bring the grey head of the parent to the grave in grief and tears,' we can comprehend how he appealed in vain. But could he have seen into the future, and have told them that in the fulness of time these laws would recoil in ruin upon the children of their authors—that the severance they would cause between the two nations of Ireland would mainly injure that of British origin—that if they would coerce the Roman Catholic tenant, and cover the soil of Ireland with a race of hopeless cottiers, they would sap the strength

and wealth of the Protestant aristocracy—and that while, in spite of them, the Irish race would continue, many of the English race, by reason of them, would be uprooted from the soil—we think they would have shunned the impending Nemesis, could they have known this.

The character of the old land-system of Ireland is a sufficient answer to those writers who, ashamed at these specimens of Protestant persecution, insinuate that the penal laws were never enforced. It is probable, indeed, that the natural feelings of man generally prevented Roman Catholic children from filching their fathers' estates by an interested apostacy. And yet Burke, who, in youth, saw the penal code in vigour, complains that these laws destroyed the authority of parents, and the dutifulness of children. It is possible, too, that the sense of common justice, gradually triumphing over the instincts of oppression, and caste, and bigotry, raised a moral barrier against some of their effects. But to them, we think, the old land-system of Ireland owed its peculiar character. The narrowing of the market for freehold estates to the Protestant settlers—that is, to a small minority of the Irish nation—by preventing the free transfer of land, encouraged the incumbering it. It is true, indeed, that the Roman Catholics were prevented from taking a mortgage; but they were enabled to advance money upon judgments—a species of security which, as we shall see hereafter, entangles land beyond all others, and which, under the influence of certain statutes, presently to be noticed, gradually encumbered almost every estate in Ireland. Hence began the embarrassments of the Irish proprietary, which the Penal Code also indirectly increased, by severing landlords from their tenantry and their duties, and forming them into a non-resident or an extravagant squirearchy. The exclusion of the Roman Catholics from freehold tenures, the general sense of insecurity to Protestants, and the habits of caste generated by this code, were the probable cause of the creation of middlemen. The Protestant owner in fee simple, confined in the choice of freeholders for his estates to his own co-religionists, and despising the Roman Catholic peasantry around him, was not sorry to place a Protestant yeomanry between himself and the occupiers of the soil. If they obtained his land at a low rent, they afforded him protection and countenance, and relieved him from the drudgery of oppression. How these conductors of tyranny cringed to their superiors, and kept in bondage the Roman Catholics beneath them—how they disregarded agriculture as a pursuit only fit for their undertenants, and aped the profusion and vices of their landlords, is graphically described by Arthur Young. The Penal Code

also, by refusing to the Roman Catholic nation a lengthened tenure of land, and all rewards of industry, tended to fasten upon the soil that hopeless, slavish, and incapable race of cottiers who but lately have been rooted from it. The degradation of this class has long been a bye-word. Its 'indolence and apathy' provoked a sneer even from the humane Berkeley. It was despised and pitied by Swift. Its hapless condition was portrayed by Grattan and by Burke. But of the writers we have read, Arthur Young alone ascribes its state to the true cause—the Penal Code. Finally, the penal laws, by their commercial restrictions, tended to perpetuate the land-system they had formed. They checked the growth of a middle class who would have raised a barrier to the Protestant aristocracy. They prevented the diffusion of those humanising influences which follow the increase of opulence. They forced back upon the soil all classes of the Irish nation. As far as they could, they shut off Irish enterprise from the sea, that element which, as Arnold observes, deserves to be hated by all aristocracies, since it is the parent of healthful civilisation.

During the period between 1778 and 1793, this commercial code, and the penal laws, so far as they affected the social rights of the Irish Roman Catholics, were repealed. But the political restrictions made by these laws were not removed until the Emancipation Act of 1829. In this interval, during which Roman Catholic freedom was emerging from its long eclipse, the land-system of Ireland, in some particulars, was improved, but, as a whole, was not essentially altered. It is true, indeed, that after 1778, very few middleman tenures were created, and that the rental of Ireland was greatly increased. But neither commerce, nor manufactures, took root in the country. The embarrassments of the landed gentry continued, and the sales of landed estates were uncommon. The middleman tenures, being generally leases of lives renewable for ever, when once granted, rarely expired. The Irish Courts of Equity, indeed, made these tenures their peculiar care, and enforced renewals, however long the right, at law, may have expired. Agriculture undoubtedly advanced, at least upon the area freed from cottier tenants, but in a far lesser degree than in Scotland or England, and was never based on a hopeful foundation. The cottier tenantry of Ireland, who formed the majority of its farmers, swelled in numbers, but we fear declined in prosperity. Arthur Young, indeed, says of them, that considering their poverty and degradation, he wonders how they tilled the land at all. But his book nowhere gives the account of them contained in the Devon Commission Report. And, as increasing competition for land marks this

period, which at once raised rent and reduced profits, a check was placed upon agricultural prosperity. Thus, the poverty of the lower agricultural classes of Ireland increased in intensity, while the upper classes advanced in wealth. While their relative condition was somewhat altered, the character of the land-system remained the same. Why this was so; why the landlords and middlemen of Ireland remained embarrassed; why the land of Ireland was practically kept out of free commerce; why its lower agricultural classes did not rise in the social scale; and why, after the repeal of the Penal Code, the land-system of Ireland so long continued unchanged, and still betrays some of its original features, we proceed briefly to explain.

In the first place, the consequences of confiscation, and of the penal and old commercial codes of Ireland, could not disappear with a change of the law. Of all sins, political sins are those which most certainly transmit their effects to succeeding generations. The tone of national feeling, the habits of class oppression and abasement, and the peculiar form which the Irish land-system had taken, could not be removed by the obliteration of a code. And it is probable that the long-continued exclusion of the Roman Catholics from political franchises indirectly retarded the growth of a better state of things. But several special causes protracted the effects of the past. In the first place, a considerable number of Irish landlords have always been, and even now remain, absentees. It has been supposed that their incomes represent one-fourth of the rental of the country. Now, absenteeism was a strong element in maintaining the old Irish land-system. It tended, directly, in many estates, and indirectly in all estates, to keep apart the landlords and tenantry of Ireland. For the absentee proprietors have ever been the most considerable in the country; and have, therefore, set to all Irish landlords the example of delegating the management of their estates to agents, of acquiring foreign habits and ideas, and of despising the lower Irish nation. Absenteeism, too, contributed to increase the number of Irish encumbered proprietors. When a landlord goes abroad, and intrusts his affairs to others for a considerable length of time, his gradual impoverishment may be expected. His estate is ill-managed; he acquires prodigal habits in the foreign towns where he usually resides; he lays out nothing in improvements at home; and occasionally he is plundered by those whom he employs. It is very certain that these effects of non-residence have operated widely in Ireland. Absenteeism, also, tended to make the industrial classes of Ireland poorer than they would naturally have been, and thus to prevent the farming class from rising

in condition. The assetion made by Irish popular speakers, that the entire sum of absentee Irish rents is withdrawn from the fund for employing Irish labour, is no doubt untrue; since, even were the absentees to return home, a large amount of foreign commodities would enter into their consumption. And it may be true, had the state of things ever existed in Ireland which Mr. M'Culloch *seems* to postulate as the basis of his proof, that, economically, absenteeism is harmless; namely, had there been enough of capital in the country to employ all its labour at ordinary wages, and had farming capital been able to secure to itself the common profits of stock, it would have been indifferent to the Irish nation whether the absentees spent their rents at home or abroad. But, in the state of Ireland under its old land system, with a vast overplus of labour as compared with capital, and therefore with numbers of labourers unemployed, and with the profits of farming capital reduced to the lowest point, we conceive that absenteeism was very impoverishing. For, *first*—it forced into the foreign market a quantity of Irish agricultural produce which, were the absentees resident, would have been consumed in the Irish market; and thereby threw partly on the farmer and partly on the landlord the loss resulting from the cost of transit and of deteriorations. It is true that, before the Irish farmers could pay any rent at all, they must, by a sale of agricultural produce, have replaced their capitals, with *some* profit. But the question is, did they do this, without any loss to their landlords and with the *same* profit to themselves, under a system of absenteeism, as they would have done were the Irish landlords resident? We think they did not; because the withdrawal abroad of a large number of proprietors, and therefore of some of the manufacturers and artificers they would employ, tended to transfer the demand for their produce from the home to the foreign market,—that is, from a market which it reached cheaply to a market which it reached with loss and expense. Nor, practically, did it make any difference, if, as was usually the case, the absentee rents were remitted, not in produce, but in bills of exchange or foreign drafts, since, to pay for these representatives of produce, the produce itself must ultimately have gone abroad; and therefore an amount of produce, to make up the expense and loss we have referred to, must have been exported, which would not have been necessary had the absentees been at home. And we think that this loss fell partly upon the landlord in a reduction of rent, and partly upon the farmer in a diminution of profit, and thus, to a considerable extent, lessened the fund for Irish employ-

ment. *Secondly*—absenteeism seems to us, directly to have reduced the fund for Irish labour. The removal of the absentees from Ireland naturally drew with them a certain number of manufacturers and artificers, who followed their customers abroad, and whose capitals, were they resident, would have been invested in Irish labour, and therefore would have relieved the Irish land system from the weight of cottier farmers, whereas, in the actual state of things, they did not attract Irish labour. Besides, had the absentee landlords of Ireland been resident, it is probable their rents would have been spent in a very different way from that in which they were actually spent. It is probable that, instead of being annually *consumed*, as Mr. M'Culloch seems to think they were, in exchange partly for foreign and partly for Irish commodities, they would, in many cases, to some extent at least, have gradually been converted into capitals for farming at home, or otherwise employing Irish labour. It is probable, therefore, that absenteeism tended to waste, in the foreign market, funds that naturally should have become movers of Irish industry, and therefore to have deprived Irish labour, at a time when it was extremely redundant, of a portion of its natural sustenance.

Thus, we think that, under the old land system of Ireland, absenteeism was socially and economically injurious, and must be so still under its existing system. But at present we conceive that its economic effects are trifling. The cheap and rapid means of transit from all parts of Ireland to the best markets abroad, though but lately established, must greatly reduce the loss and the expense of the exportation caused by absenteeism. And as, since the famine, the great demand for land has ceased, it is probable that, henceforth, the Irish farmers will be able to throw this entire loss upon their landlords, and thereby to prevent their capitals, the natural fund for employing Irish labour, from suffering from it. The emigration of so large a portion of the population has stopped the overcrowding of the labour market, has already greatly raised wages, and is rapidly adjusting the ratio which, in a safe state of society, capital should bear to labour. Hence, in the actual state of things, with the profits of farming capital rising to a fair level, and with a full demand for labour at good wages, we think that, unless a vast unemployed population shall again spring up in Ireland, absenteeism will not be of much economic evil.

Another cause which, by impeding the free transfer of land and loading it with incumbrances, tended to continue the old land system of Ireland, was the operation of certain statutes upon Irish real property, which produced a state of things with

which the Irish Courts of Equity could not cope. It may safely be affirmed that, during the seventy years which elapsed from 1778 to 1848, the land of Ireland, though legally open to alienation, was practically less in commerce, and more subject to embarrassment than the land in any other part of Great Britain.

Under the system of conveyancing which prevails in England there is no public registry of deeds, and it is settled law that a third incumbrancer, without notice that a second exists, may join his charge to the first, and thus, as it is called, 'squeeze out' the intervening one. The practical result of this must be to prevent the accumulation in a number of hands of charges upon land, and to consolidate into one the incumbrances on real estate. Hence, in England the transfer of embarrassed landed property is cheap and expeditious, and is often effected under a power of sale inserted in mortgage deeds, without the intervention of an equity suit. Again, in England the practice of charging lands with judgment debts has never prevailed; for, as judgments in that country are not legally assignable, they naturally do not form a permanent security, and, besides, do not give the rights of mortgages. And hence the land of England has fortunately been free from a kind of charge which, unlike a mortgage that binds certain lands specifically, is a potential lien on all the debtor's property, both present and future, and which, when multiplied, meshes land in an inextricable network. In Ireland, however, under a statute of Queen Anne, a public registry of deeds has existed, which, without giving any real security to titles, has charged the transfer of real estate with heavy costs, and has greatly multiplied the number of its incumbrances. For, while a registered incumbrancer, or purchaser, is bound by every unregistered deed of which he or his agent may have notice,—which has nullified the supposed safeguards of a registry,—this system has swelled the length of abstracts of title, and of costs and stamps of conveyance, and, by preventing the English practice of 'tacking,' has stopped the consolidation of charges. Again, an act of George II. made Irish judgment debts assignable at law,—in fact, as transferable as bills of exchange; and two statutes, passed within the last twenty years, armed them with rights of a most stringent character; and hence this mischievous security—which binds every acre of land which the debtor may ever acquire, and thus keeps his estate out of commerce till satisfied—has become, as it has been termed, the 'common assurance' of the country. It is true that, in 1849 and 1850, the legislature interfered, and for the future checked these mischiefs, by reducing the effects of a

judgment to those of a common mortgage; but of course the statutes then passed were not retrospective. The joint operation of the registry and judgment-debt systems existing in Ireland, by enveloping land in manifold incumbrances, made the transfer of embarrassed estates, except through the medium of the Courts of Equity, practically impossible. But for this operation the machinery of these courts was both cumbrous and weak. They had no power to convey land to a purchaser at all. All they could do was to compel the mortgaged owner and his incumbrancers to concur in the conveyance. Nor did they pretend to give any title under their decrees, but said fairly to a purchaser 'caveat emptor.' And this being the limit of their powers, they were naturally tedious and expensive in the exercise of a jurisdiction which they could not make efficient. When a bill in equity was filed for the sale of a mortgaged estate every person interested must have been brought before the court. Before the decree for sale could be made the rights of all parties must have been ascertained. After this process, which generally required years to conclude—such was the multiplicity and variety of claims,—the estate was sold by public auction. But this sale was not conclusive, for perhaps the title was defective, or some necessary party to the conveyance could not be found, or perhaps some better bidder appeared. And thus the process of selling an Irish estate in the Irish Courts of Equity, able as generally were their judges and officers, was marked by a ruinous delay and a series of impediments. Such being the state of things, two results followed: either the parties interested in embarrassed estates kept them out of the Equity Courts altogether—and thus these lands remained wholly out of commerce, and in general wholly unimproved,—or else years passed in wasteful litigation preceded their transfer by this 'equitable method.' It is hard to conceive anything more certain to aggravate the evils of a land system which especially required the breaking up of a large and embarrassed proprietary.

All checks upon the free transfer of embarrassed lands in Ireland have been removed by the Incumbered Estates Act of 1849. At present, it is easier to sell an embarrassed estate in Ireland than an estate altogether free from debt. The court which this Act has established, possesses the very powers for the sale of real estate which were wanting to the Irish Courts of Equity. Upon proof of land being embarrassed to half its value, the Court gathers into itself the rights of the parties interested, conveys the land directly to a purchaser by an indefeasible title, and transfers these rights to the fund which represents it. And thus it speedily frees land for alienation, however

numerous and complicated the incumbrances affecting it. Before its sweeping process the shackles which had involved Irish estates fall off and disappear, and the soil is relieved from its entangling burden. So long as the principles upon which the court acts continue in force, the complication of debt caused by the Registry and Judgment Acts may, indeed, ruin individuals, but will never allow Irish land to fall again into mortmain. Besides the Incumbered Estates Act, a statute of 1850 has greatly simplified the practice of the Irish Court of Chancery in respect to the sale of land. But, so long as the original inferiority in its constitution remains,—namely, its inability to convey real estate by an indefeasible title,—the ancient can never compete with the modern tribunal. So far, however, as regards ascertaining the rights of the suitors, the Court of Chancery has necessarily a great advantage. We think the time has arrived for uniting into one these two jurisdictions. At present, we believe it would be desirable to give the Irish Court of Chancery the statutable powers now confined to the Incumbered Estates Court, and thus to extend this peculiar jurisdiction to all estates whatever, however lightly incumbered. This would restore to a long-established court—the judges, officers, and bar of which, in Ireland as in England, have ever been of conspicuous merit—a jurisdiction which now has wellnigh left it, but which, if it once had an authority similar to that given by the Incumbered Estates Act, it would exercise with general satisfaction.

Another influence which preserved the old land system of Ireland, by multiplying cottiers upon its soil, was the absence of any state provision for the poor, until the year 1840. A salutary policy, since the days of Elizabeth, has charged property in England with the sustenance of poverty of the lowest kind, and thus has made it the interest of the powerful to check its accumulation, and has prevented it sinking into complete destitution. In Ireland, until fifteen years ago, this check was wanting; and the incentives the other way were very strong. The increase of population raised rent, by encouraging the competition for land, and was therefore pleasing to the landlords, who were the depositaries of power. The degradation of the cottier peasantry, stimulated by the teaching of the Roman Catholic clergy—who, being wholly dependent upon voluntary contributions for their support, and having a direct interest in the multiplication of their flocks, promoted early marriages,—and an Act of the Irish Parliament, passed in 1793, which extended the electoral franchise to Roman Catholic forty-shilling freeholders, induced the landlords of the day to encourage a population whose dependence gave them

power, and who cost them nothing. Hence everything conspired to swell the swarms of the cottier population. We have seen how this element disturbed the old land system of Ireland, by forcing up rent, preventing good farming, and narrowing the area for real agriculture. Fortunately, it is now removed, and its recurrence is stopped, by a Poor Law which instantly charges the landlord with the entire support of the lowest cottiers; which refuses relief to those holding more than a quarter of an acre of land; which, even in the case of existing tenancies, levies half the poor-rate from the landlord; and which, of course, will ultimately throw all its burden on him. It may, perhaps, be admitted, that this Poor Law, when suddenly brought to bear upon the fearful pauperism of 1847-8-9, was wastefully administered, and even now is deficient in its machinery; but if, as we anticipate, it shall preserve the soil of Ireland from a tenantry of paupers, it will be the best safeguard of its present land system.

The last cause of the continuance of the old land system of Ireland, which kept back Irish farming by banishing capital from the soil, was the operation upon the relation of Irish landlords and tenants of the Common Law with respect to tenants' improvements incorporated with the land. It is evidently natural justice, that the tenant who by his capital and skill has converted waste into arable or meadow land, or who has covered a bare area with homesteads and farm-buildings, should retain a property in these improvements upon the expiration of his term, or else should be entitled to reimbursement for them. But when municipal law has to make a general rule that shall strike the balance of justice in all conceivable cases, it is equally clear that, while it can easily appropriate to the tenant all subjects that are capable of removal in specie, without injuring the landlord's freehold, it is almost impossible for it, without giving ready means for fraud and spoliation, to apply the same principle to subjects that have been moulded into the soil. In these cases it *must* adopt the expedient of compensation, and to this the objections are almost insuperable. Is it to be left to the frail security of an oath to determine the value of improvements no longer distinguishable, and the traces of which may be effaced? And if this shall be so, is a set-off to be given for deteriorations which may be equally impossible to ascertain? And even if an account of this kind—about the items and vouchers of which there would be endless disputes, supported by every kind of falsehood and chicanery—could ultimately be adjusted, how is the expense of compensation to be apportioned between

partial owners of the estate? What is to be borne by a tenant for life, or a mortagor, and what by a remainder-man or a mortgagee? Again, is a tenant, by extensive building, or planting, or making costly accessories to the land, to 'improve' —as it has been said—'his landlord out of his estate?' The Common Law, conscious of these difficulties, appropriates to the tenant, though with some unjust modifications, almost all subjects which his own skill or money may have annexed to the soil during his tenancy, if they are capable of being removed without losing their identity, and without injuring the freehold. But it confiscates to the landlord all other subjects, for the purpose of compelling the tenant to compound for their value by express contract. This rule, which we think the fairest that can be devised—assuming that the parties are free to strike their bargain,—has worked well in England, and, practically, has forced English landlords either to supply their farms with the improvements they require, or else to pay their tenants for outlays in respect of them. But in Ireland, under its old land system, the case was different. Its tenantry, lowered in the social scale, and placed under duress by a state of society in which the competition for land forced up its rent extravagantly, could seldom retain a property in what they had united to the soil, or acquire an equivalent in money. And it must be added, as the cottier tenantry seldom made any improvements at all, but, on the other hand, often wasted the land, the Irish landlords were frequently justified in disregarding this matter. Hence, either the land remained unimproved, or even became injured, to the detriment of agriculture, or the landlords were permitted to reap the fruit of their tenants' outlays. The law which, under another system, was reasonable, in Ireland was productive of calamity and wrong.

Now, however, when the old land system of Ireland has been broken up, and the extreme competition for land has ceased, and when, therefore, the Irish tenant may fairly settle with his landlord the terms of his contract, we think it would be unwise to alter a law which seems adapting itself to the existing state of things. We think it would be prudent not to force on the tenantry of Ireland, now that undoubtedly they are free agents, the obligation of adjusting with their landlords what they shall receive for improvements, and to expose these classes to all the bickering, litigation, and inequity which would necessarily follow legislation on this delicate subject. When it is open to the parties to apply to each case a rule that must be more just than any general rule can be, it seems to us worse than folly to interfere by law. We think, however, that the re-

strictions and exceptions which the common law has imposed with regard to the removal of tenants' improvements capable of severance from the soil, should be abolished; and we trust that a measure of this kind would satisfy the Irish farmers. For, though it cannot be denied that since the break down of the old land system of Ireland, a violent agitation has arisen upon this subject, and that at the general election of 1852 almost every popular constituency returned a 'Tenant League' candidate; still, as we believe that, in the existing state of Ireland, the law is just in principle, we cannot advocate its serious alteration. We believe the present land system of Ireland would only suffer from such a change.

And thus, of the causes, remote and proximate, which, in our judgment, produced the old land system of Ireland, some are extinguished, and some remain in active operation. As the effects of the antipathy of race and sect were the most inveterate, they will probably be the last to vanish, and may still for a time affect the existing state of things. But we believe they are gradually disappearing from the soil. For their removal the statesman must rely upon the healing influences of time,—upon the gradual introduction of a new race of landlords, freed from the associations that hung around their predecessors,—upon the elevation of the Roman Catholic nation of Ireland by material prosperity, and social honour,—upon education,—and upon the effects of a government that shall ignore mere distinctions of caste. And it must, we think, be admitted that during the last thirty years the government of Great Britain has been just and generous to the Irish people. It has passed the Emancipation Act, and the Municipal Corporations Act; it has given Ireland a Poor Law, and has freed its land by the Incumbered Estates Act; it has devoted many millions to public works, and to measures for Irish relief. Nor has it been wanting in that impartiality and kindness which distinguish a wise administration of affairs. It has checked agrarian crime to the utmost of its power; and it has stopped those odious party processions which celebrate Protestant triumphs and Roman Catholic degradation. It has freely admitted Roman Catholics to preferment, and many eminent names—Archbishop Murray, Sir Michael O'Loghlen, Chief Justice Monahan, Chief Baron Pigot, and others—prove how well Roman Catholic talent can serve the Crown. We believe the salutary influences thus created will gradually diffuse themselves into the relations of the landlords and tenants of Ireland, and will eradicate the vice that still taints its land system. We trust this event is not far distant. It

has been remarked that the soil of Ireland is still strewn with the shattered relics and broken fragments of a bitter strife. But we hope that Time will soon cover them with kindly dust, and that if afterwards they shall be laid bare, they may only move a feeling akin to the pitying wonder of Virgil's husbandman, as his ploughshare unsepulchred the 'empty helmets and the mighty bones' of the buried foemen.

W. O'C. M.

NATIONAL EDUCATION.

THE three bills on education introduced last session showed an amount and kind of agreement that seems at length to promise some real issue to the controversy on the subject. The question has not yet, perhaps, been sufficiently discussed in the country at large. It is still in the hands of statesmen, of interested politicians, of ecclesiastical party leaders. The clergy of the Church, the ministers of other Christian denominations, a few members of Parliament, a few independent thinkers, read, and write, and talk of the matter a good deal. But the discussion has not yet reached the great mass of the middle classes, who are really so much interested in it that their voice, if once pronounced, would finally settle all the points in dispute. The concurrence of opinion, therefore, so far as there is a concurrence of opinion between three such men as Lord John Russell, Sir John Pakington, and Mr. Cobden, cannot yet be accepted as conclusive. Yet these three men are spokesmen of three large, and, what is more to the purpose in this land of compromise, of the three middle divisions of opinion on this matter. On one side stand the High Churchmen, or Denominational Party, who may be supposed to be represented in Parliament by Mr. Henley; on the other side are the Voluntaries, who have not many, if any, representatives in the House of Commons, but are headed by Mr. Edward Baines. Both these extremes agree in refusing to acknowledge any paramount civil character in education; both advocate a peculiar kind of religious liberty. But the High Churchmen would accept State assistance if they could obtain it without such an amount of State control as would rob their schools of the ecclesiastical character; in fact, they seem tolerably well contented with the conditions on which the Government at present assists them. The Voluntaries, on the contrary, refuse State assistance altogether, on the ground that it is unjust to make one man pay for the inculcation of another man's opinions. Between Mr. Henley (who is certainly not an extravagant High Churchman) and Mr. Baines

are the sections from which the three bills emanate. Behind these sections probably stand the middle classes of this country; if it be so, the final result is certain. But whatever may be the final result as between these three parties, one of the points on which they are all agreed—the necessity of a rate—may be considered as settled. And if all else had better wait, this ought not to wait any longer.

The questions at issue are three: Who is to pay for the schools? who is to govern the schools? and, what is to be taught in the schools? These questions are so bound up in one another that the answer to any one practically determines the answers to the others. According to the leading rule of all English politics, whoever pays will govern, and whoever governs will decide what is to be taught. One of these questions, therefore, must be made the primary, and, when settled, will assist in settling the others. The question chosen for the primary has almost always been the last. The promoters of education begin with their own idea of education, and argue from that to the means of obtaining it.

In discussing this third question, it is plain that the school may be contemplated from two sides—the religious and the civil. It may propose to prepare children for another world, or for this. These two purposes are not incompatible. All would grant that the best way to prepare a child for another world is to prepare him to do his duty in this. But though not incompatible, the purposes are sufficiently distinct to permit each to be considered separately, and even exclusively. There is obviously a common ground on which they meet. The moral training which is essential to religious, is no less essential to civil education. Habits of strict truth, of honesty, of self-control, of persevering industry and order,—all, in short, that is inculcated in the *Catechism* under the head of My Duty to my Neighbour, is as needful for this world as if there were no other world to follow. But how best God may be worshipped, and what the Bible has taught us which we could not otherwise have known, belong more properly to religious; the knowledge and the discipline which will enable a child, when grown up, more easily to get his bread, more properly to civil education. The truth, perhaps, is, that the relation between these is somewhat like that between the food of the mind and the food of the body; one is higher, the other more indispensable; one is needed for living rightly, the other for living at all. Without religious teaching, education is imperfect; without civil teaching, education does not exist. The school will not generally profess to give the whole of education, whether civil or religious. Pauper children, in-

deed, are so entirely thrown upon the State, that the pauper school, as the delegate of the State, ought to do for them all that both school and parents will do for others. But, in all ordinary cases, a considerable part of the education must be obtained elsewhere than at school. The school cannot act as an apprenticeship to particular trades. The Church, and not the school, must cultivate the habit of worship. The home, and not the school, is capable of giving the deepest and truest religious teaching. Thus the school has to choose its circle of operation out of a large area, and may confine itself to a portion of the civil teaching, or may include a portion of the religious teaching also.

If civil teaching be the chief purpose of the school, and the religious teaching be left to other and special agencies, the answer to the two remaining questions need not be difficult. The schools may, as in America, be wholly or chiefly maintained by rates, and governed by the ratepayers. The plan which proposes to educate the people in schools of this sort is called the Secular Plan, and the schools are called Secular Schools. Such schools would not be irreligious; at the utmost, they would be simply non-religious. Indeed, there would be nothing to prevent the master in a school of this kind from using such religious topics in speaking to individual boys as every master constantly uses when he would give emphasis to his words. Though he would feel everything like distinctive doctrinal teaching to be beyond his province, and would hold himself responsible to the ratepayers who appointed him if he so stepped beyond it, yet he would not scruple on that account to speak to a naughty child of the omnipresence of God, or to a quarrelsome one of the example of Christ. He would be obliged to bear in mind the prohibition of all religious instruction, and to use his discretion in interpreting the limits of that prohibition, and his discretion would of course be liable to be overruled by his superiors. But everyone knows that in this country no master would have need to fear that he would be forbidden to use such broad fundamental dogmas as alone can enter into the discipline of a school of children. There would, therefore, be no reason to suppose that the secular school would by its non-religious character in the slightest degree interfere with the impressions made by the Sunday-school, the Sunday worship, or any other means employed to give the distinctly religious teaching. The English, however, or, at any rate, those who have done most for education hitherto among us, are not disposed to look favourably on the Secular Plan, and the number of secular schools actually established does not amount on the largest calculation to one and a-half per cent. of the

whole. The avowed exclusion of religious teaching is not in accordance with English feeling.

If the teaching in school is to be religious as well as civil, a necessity seems to arise for a different kind of management. Ratepayers, as such, are not religious; they may be of any religion or none. Under a government by ratepayers religion may not be excluded, but such a government seems to offer no security that it will be included. Nor can this security be obtained by general rules which define the instruction. Those rules may prescribe a catechism or a portion of the Bible; but the formula learnt, or the book read, seems to form but a small part of religious teaching. Indeed, in so far as the religion is to affect the after life, the *Catechism* will, generally speaking, be remembered only if associated with daily practices. The prayers at commencing and dismissing the school, the weekly attendance at church, the frequent presence of the clergyman, the half-clerical look and manner of the schoolmaster, will make an unconscious but abiding impression on most children; the words of a catechism on very few. Many, indeed, can remember with a kind of religious association 'standing up to say the *Catechism*,' who have a very indistinct memory of the words which they learnt, and a still more indistinct conception of the meaning of those words. In fact, the religious impression made by any school really depends, first, upon the character and bearing of the master, secondly upon the nature of the daily routine, and least of all upon the subjects of instruction. It is quite conceivable that a school in which religious instruction was altogether excluded might have a much more religious effect than one in which religious instruction was made the prominent feature. If, therefore, the school is to be made the means of giving religious teaching, it would seem to follow that the security for such teaching must be found, not in the rules which define the instruction, but in the character of the immediate management. For that will decide what sort of qualifications will be preferred in a master, and with what sort of associations the scholars will be perpetually surrounded. And the only method yet suggested for procuring religious management is to entrust the school to the authorities of the Church and the other great religious communities which, either by office or by a sort of tacit consent, are recognised as the representatives of religion in the country.

If the religious communities are to govern the schools, it will follow that they must pay for them. In so far as they cannot afford to pay, they will obviously have no right to govern. If they accept State assistance, they will have to

submit to State control. The schools thus seem to lose, to a certain extent, their religious character. There is a considerable party, presently to be spoken of, who are content to stop at the conclusion that education is the business of the religious communities, in so far as it cannot be attained by the parents of the children to be educated. Repudiating State control, they repudiate also State assistance, and would leave to the irregular working of religious zeal what they acknowledge to be a pressing need. But the great majority is against them, and anxiously seeks for some mode of reconciling the duty to educate the people with the claims of our divided Christianity. Three such modes or systems have been proposed, and have received the names of the Denominational, the Comprehensive, and the Combined.

The Denominational method is, to have separate schools for the separate religious denominations, and to supply them with a sufficient amount of State aid to enable them to cover the country. On this plan the Church would have her schools, the Wesleyans have theirs, the Independents have theirs. If two or more sects choose to combine, there is nothing to prevent them; but neither is there anything to encourage them,—such a combination must simply be considered as constituting, for the occasion, a new sect. Every school would, of course, teach the doctrines, and be managed by the representatives or officers, of the denomination to which it belonged.

This plan really does secure a good deal, perhaps too much, of what is commonly meant by religious teaching, and that, too, in the doctrinal form which the advocates of religious teaching, as such, generally consider to be alone worthy of the name. Indeed, it not only secures the teaching of religious doctrine, but has a perpetual tendency towards making preparation for future religious controversy. The clergyman secretly hopes that his careful explanation of the *Catechism* will hereafter save his scholars from Dissent. The Dissenter often endeavours to arm his scholars against Popery. A good deal of energy is unquestionably thus wasted in trying to arm children with weapons which they are not yet strong enough to wield. But, on the whole, perhaps some sort of religious teaching is as well secured on this plan as on any other that can be devised, even if it be not quite the best for children to have. And partly for this reason, partly from the naturally greater zeal of religious communities in the discharge of a duty of philanthropy, partly from the peculiar operation of the government measures, the Denominational system has the advantage over its rivals of almost complete possession of the ground.

Omitting schools entirely supported by endowments, or by the State, more than ninety-three per cent. of the elementary schools are of a denominational character; and if we omit Ragged and Factory Schools, and others of a similar nature, whose peculiar objects make them in some degree a special class, of the ordinary elementary schools in which the children of the labourers are educated, ninety-five per cent. are Denominational.

The Comprehensive Plan proposes to establish schools in which so much religion shall be taught as all are willing to agree in. In a country which, besides containing many varieties of Protestants, contains also Jews and Roman Catholics, the subtraction of all the differences would leave so little that it would be hardly worth while to insist on retaining it. The Jews and Roman Catholics are, therefore, set apart to be treated as special exceptions. And since the Bible is the acknowledged standard of all Protestant communions, the daily reading of the Bible is proposed as the definition of the religious instruction. All religious formularies, except the Bible, are expressly prohibited, though a requirement is generally added, that each child shall attend some place of worship on Sunday, wherever its parents may prefer. Thus the instruction is defined, and so far all is easy. But to determine what shall be the government to give the life and tone to this instruction is excessively difficult. If it were possible to find in every district men belonging to each denomination, sufficiently interested in religious movements to be leaders in their respective communions, yet sufficiently large-minded to be superior to all prejudices—men who were tolerant according to Coleridge's definition of tolerance, tolerant without being cold or indifferent,—it is conceivable that managing committees on the Comprehensive principle might be everywhere formed. But religious leaders are generally quite as much attached to their own special dogma as to the religious spirit which they clothe in that dogma. It is possible sometimes to bring the representatives of two or three denominations into harmonious action. But everywhere to unite the officers of every denomination that might happen to be in a district, would be a hopeless undertaking. Above all, it is peculiarly difficult to unite in one board the clergy of the Church with the preachers or ministers of Dissenting communities. The Dissenters, for many reasons, are more hostile to the Church than to one another. They have separated from the Church; not from one another. They are like each other and unlike the Church in their civil position and endowments. The result is, that if ever the clergy of the Church act with Dissenters, as

such, all alike are much more on the footing of fellow citizens engaged in a civil, than of fellow Christians engaged in a religious duty. If the Comprehensive Plan were made universal it would probably be religious in that sense, and in that sense only, in which schools would be religious that were governed by the ratepayers.

As it is, the Comprehensive Plan has had but a very partial success. Its great representative is the British and Foreign School Society. Its most strenuous defenders are the Baptists, though they object to all State assistance in extending it. The Independents are willing to support it, but are equally ready to support the Denominational. The Church, the Roman Catholics, the Quakers, the Wesleyans, and the Jews, generally have schools of their own. Many schools, organised on the Comprehensive Plan, have practically fallen, nevertheless, under Denominational government. From this tendency which the system has to lose its comprehensiveness and fall into the hands of separate sects, it is difficult to estimate its hold upon the schools. On the highest computation, the number of schools organised and governed on the strictly comprehensive plan, cannot amount to more than five per cent. of the whole. But the advocates of this system are not so precise in their definition of what they want, and are more easily satisfied with practical approximations, than those who support the Denominational plan; and they would claim many schools as practically realizing their views, which to all intents are Denominational; they calculate that seventeen per cent. of the scholars now under instruction are taught according to their principles.

The Combined Plan, one form of which was advocated seven or eight years ago by Dr. Hook, has had few supporters who prefer it to all others. But the Secular party, driven from their original scheme by the angry resistance of the denominations and the passive resistance of the country, have now generally come over to it. This plan proposes to separate the civil from the religious instruction,—to put the former under the ratepayers, the latter under the denominations,—but to provide in some degree, if not entirely, for both. On this plan there would be one school in a parish for all denominations; but there would be special opportunities for the officers of each denomination to give religious teaching to the children belonging to that denomination. How far this provision is to extend—whether a class-room is to be built for each sect, or the school-room altogether is to be given up to each sect in turn,—or in what way the religious teaching is to be communicated, may be variously determined. But the essential

feature of this scheme, as distinct from the Secular, is the recognition of religious teaching as part of the school business.

The only schools organised in some degree on the Combined plan, are those in the workhouses and prisons. The workhouse schools are subject to the guardians—the prison schools to the visiting justices; but in each the religious teaching of all children, who are not withdrawn from his charge by their parents, is entrusted to the chaplain: such children are considered to belong to the Church. The preachers or ministers of other denominations are at liberty to undertake the religious teaching of any whose parents request them to do so; subject, of course, to the paramount authority of the guardians or justices. Practically, the chaplain rarely finds any objection made to his teaching.

It is obvious that the four systems described—the Denominational, the Comprehensive, the Combined, and the Secular—might shade off into one another. A school, for instance, may be under denominational government with comprehensive rules of instruction, as is often the case; or other modifications of one plan by another might be devised.

The purely Secular scheme is now tacitly given up; the other three are advocated by the five parties which are pushing their several proposals. The two extremes, under Mr. Henley and Mr. Baines, are, on the whole, supporters of the Denominational scheme—the High Churchmen from choice, the Voluntaries in self-defence against the aggressive action of the Church; for, if quite free from all fears of such aggression, they would prefer the Comprehensive. Sir John Pakington inclines also to the Denominational; Lord John Russell, true to his long connexion with the British and Foreign School Society, to the Comprehensive; Mr. Cobden, to the Combined plan, and that in a form almost equivalent to the Secular. The Committee of Council is the centre round which the battle between these parties is fought. But the Committee of Council cannot, without assistance, go on much longer in the path hitherto followed, and has already, indeed, begun to diverge a little from its original policy. The Voluntary party wish the next step to be retrograde; they would undo most of what has been done. The Denominational, or High Church party, would go on, but, since they cannot go on in the original direction, they would accept the divergence, with all its consequences. The three other parties would build up a municipal system to work conjointly with the central action of the Committee, and by that means preserve the policy that has been hitherto successful.

The Committee of Council has expended, between its esta-

blishment in 1839 and the end of 1855, a total sum of about £2,000,000. This has been divided between the following objects:—

I. On building, enlarging, repairing, and furnishing Elementary and Normal Schools	£750,000
II. On Inspection	210,000
III. On Pupil Teachers and Assistant Teachers .	670,000
IV. On Students in Training Schools and Certificated Masters	310,000
V. On Capitation Grants to Rural Schools . . .	16,000

The rest of the expenditure (about £44,000) has been required for the administration of the central office.

The building and improvement of schools was first assisted by treasury grants in 1833. The only conditions then required were a recommendation either from the National or the British and Foreign School Society, and an amount of local contributions at least equal in each case to the grant. The result was that much of the money was wasted. Although the trustees of the school were, in each case, required to sign a certificate that the school site was legally secured for the purposes of education, such certificates were often given ignorantly or carelessly, and the site was afterwards found not to have been legally secured at all. Many of the schools, also, were ill constructed. Many were so badly conducted afterwards, as to be practically useless. When the Committee of Council was established in 1839, two additional conditions were therefore imposed. In the first place, the Committee required to see the existing trust deeds of schools which they were asked to assist in improving, and the proposed trust deeds of schools which they were asked to assist in building; in the second place, they required to have a right through all future time of sending in an inspector to examine the working of the school, and report on its efficiency. But this was not enough. There was still a danger that schools might fail for want of the funds necessary to maintain them. It was by no means certain that the enthusiasm which erected would also support. For this there seemed but one remedy—namely, to give the management of each school to the subscribers. Subscribers would be much less likely to drop off from a scheme which was entirely under their own control. Accordingly, in 1847, a set of clauses were prepared with this object, and their insertion in the trust deeds of schools made a condition of government aid in building them. The result was a hot controversy. The Denominations were anxious to contract, the Government to widen, the managing body. The Government, in addition to the obvious advantage of drawing the resources of each school from as

wide an area as possible, looked also to the necessity of preventing the schools from becoming ecclesiastical rather than civil institutions. The Denominations, thinking almost solely of the religious teaching, were desirous to give a religious, and, in order to secure that, a denominational, character to the management. The controversy lasted two years, but may be considered now quite over. No new conditions have since been imposed. The Government, since 1839, has aided in building 39 normal, and in building or improving about 3800 elementary schools.

The inspection commenced very soon after the establishment of the Committee. The inspectors are always appointed with a reference to the authorities of the denominations whose schools they are to inspect; their duty is confined to examining and reporting; they cannot interfere with the management, instruction, or discipline of the schools to which they are sent; but they may advise, and generally do. This inspection, limited as it is by these restrictions, is the foundation of all the improvements which the Committee has been able to introduce. It is the letting in of the light. The first step to all real efficiency is to have a school well examined, and its deficiencies pointed out. Other steps may follow or not, but obviously till that is done nothing else can be done. The Committee professes to inspect almost any school that asks for it, but practically the inspection is limited by the number of inspectors. There are now 41 inspectors; there are 39 normal schools and about 6500 elementary schools subject to inspection. All the normal schools and 4800 of the elementary were actually inspected last year.

The next step after providing for the building and inspection of schools was to provide for the efficiency of the instruction. The schoolmasters, as a body, were often inefficient, and were not numerous enough for the work. The pupil-teacher system was therefore invented, in 1846, to assist the masters at once, and to provide a supply of better qualified masters afterwards. A pupil-teacher is a boy or a girl not under thirteen nor above sixteen, picked out of a school by examination, and by testimonials from the school authorities, and apprenticed to the master or mistress to assist in teaching the other children, and to learn the business. The apprenticeship lasts five years, and the apprentice receives annually, on passing an examination adapted to his standing, a salary rising from £10 to £20. His master is required to instruct him out of school for one hour and a half on five days in each week, and receives an annual payment for so doing. At the close of the apprenticeship the pupil-teacher may be engaged,

if he can find an engagement, as an assistant teacher. He will then receive £25 a year from the Government, and, at the end of three years, may either claim a Queen's Scholarship without further examination, or may be examined at once for a certificate as a master. Or instead of becoming an assistant teacher, a pupil-teacher of five years' standing may, by passing a prescribed examination, obtain a Queen's Scholarship at once. A Queen's Scholarship admits the owner to a training school free of all expense. The pupil-teacher is thus ultimately lodged in the training school to receive the systematic instruction which is to supply him with materials for his future profession, and on quitting it he has received probably all that education can give him. The conditions on which pupil-teachers are apprenticed are good school buildings and appliances, an efficient master, and a fair prospect that the school will be maintained for the five years. At first one pupil-teacher was allowed for twenty-five scholars, but now one for forty.

The pupil-teacher system has probably done more for education than any other measure adopted by the Committee. It has marvellously improved the schools, and has supplied a constant stream of practised teachers only needing the more methodical instructions of the training schools and the steadiness of matured experience to be all that could be desired. The growth of education may be pretty fairly estimated by the rate at which these apprentices are admitted to the registers of the Council Office. There are now about 8500 pupil-teachers at different stages of apprenticeship, and about 200 assistant teachers, who have of course been pupil-teachers before.

At the same time that the pupil-teacher system was invented, steps were taken to encourage the normal schools in training the masters, and to encourage the masters in remaining in their profession. By the regulations of 1846 the normal schools are yearly examined, and the students classed, and grants are then made to the normal schools in exact proportion to the proficiency shown by their respective students. The same examination serves as the basis of encouragement given to efficient masters. The students who undergo this examination, and any assistant teachers who may present themselves for examination at the same time, receive certificates, partly depending on their place in the class list, partly on the skill with which they afterwards conduct a school. And the managers of any school in which they may be employed as masters may thenceforward, on fulfilling certain conditions, call upon the Government to assist these masters with grants in augmentation of their salaries. The conditions to be fulfilled by the managers in every such case are, that the school and school appliances

shall be good, and that the master shall have, independent of the grant, and derived from local subscriptions and school fees, a salary at least double the grant, and that the local subscriptions shall be at least equal to the grant. There are now about 2250 masters and about 1200 mistresses in receipt of these grants.

In all these steps the Committee of Council held firmly to a definite principle. It never attempted to educate, but always to improve education. Local exertions were made an absolute condition of all assistance. Promoters of education were made clearly to understand that the public money was never given to save their pockets, but to do something which they could not do. Either by requiring conditions of efficiency, which involved an expenditure at least equal to the aid given, or by directly requiring local contributions in money, the Committee doubled, if not trebled the effect of every shilling which it expended. Had the Committee followed any other plan, the result must have been the complete annihilation of all local exertions. No man would have subscribed as long as he expected the Government to render his subscription unnecessary. The opposite policy would, in fact, have led to the centralization of education, with all its attendant evils,—enormous expense, rigidity of routine, local indifference, if not discontent, and probably, in the end, so hot and angry an opposition as must have indefinitely postponed the attainment of any complete system for the whole country. But the policy actually pursued enabled the Committee, while it improved education, to develop a system of local management, and not only to get the children taught what children ought to know, but to get the local authorities taught how to manage the schools which they erected. And all this was done at the very minimum of cost to the nation.

On the other hand, a very great strain was thus put on the voluntary exertions of the benevolent. The national duty, instead of being undertaken by the nation, was more than half thrown on private charity. In 1853 the first public indication appeared that the strain was too much, and that the system was breaking down. In April of that year a minute was passed, granting to all schools in agricultural districts and unincorporated towns not containing more than 5000 inhabitants aid towards bearing the annual expenses, in proportion to the number of scholars attending 176 days in the year. A few conditions were attached to this grant, enough to save it, perhaps, from being entirely poured into the pockets of the subscribers, but the great principle hitherto maintained was broken down. It has had a slight effect in improving the

regularity of attendance; it has compelled a few more schools than before to employ certificated teachers; it has induced a few other less important improvements. But the probability is that two-thirds of it has been spent on schools which were doing quite as well without it; and that two-thirds, therefore, has not been spent in promoting education, but in relieving others of the burden of doing so. Yet the minute is said to have saved not a few schools from bankruptcy; and if so, it is a plain proof that the Committee of Council cannot continue to maintain its old policy much longer. Hence the importance of the controversy just now. What is to be done next?

The Voluntary party would answer—Go back. This party consists chiefly of the Independents and Baptists. It came into existence as a party in 1843. Up to that time these sects, as well as most other Dissenters, had been satisfied with schools organized on the Comprehensive plan, and had not shown any unwillingness to receive aid from the State. But in the meanwhile the Church had shown a strong inclination for the Denominational system, and many of the clergy had made use of expressions tending to claim a kind of divine right to educate the people. And in 1843 the education clauses in Sir James Graham's Factory Act seemed to the Dissenters to indicate an intention on the part of the Government to make some concession to these claims. The result was a warm controversy and a reconsideration of the general question of the propriety of State interference in education. The obnoxious clauses, though they certainly might have been carried if the Government had chosen to press them, were withdrawn, and other steps were taken to assure the Dissenters that there was no intention to touch the liberty of the religious communities. The Wesleyans were eventually satisfied; the Baptists and Independents were not, and, on the whole, came to the conclusion that education is a private matter, with which the State has nothing to do.

The great argument of the Voluntaries is, that in the education of children the religious and civil teaching are so mixed up together that they cannot be separated, that the State has no right to lay out the public money in giving religious teaching, and ought not, therefore, to give money to promote education at all. To this religious argument others add a political,—namely, that education forms the opinions, and that if the Government endeavours to form the opinions of the people it is a species of tyranny.

The last argument is founded on the supposition of an impossible abuse. The King of Naples may use his schools

to inculcate political opinions, just as he may make his courts of justice instruments of oppression. But it would be as reasonable to prevent the English Government from maintaining courts of justice on such a plea, as to prevent it from aiding schools. No man can seriously fear that the Government will make schools a political engine; and those who use the argument are playing with abstractions, and not weighing practical issues.

The other argument is not logically sound. Granting, for a moment, the denial of the State's right to give religious teaching, the conclusion does not follow from the premises. It may be quite impossible to separate religious from civil teaching by hours of the day. It may be quite impossible to say that the religious teaching shall be confined to the hour between nine and ten, and that the State shall pay the master for his work after ten without inquiring who pays him for his work before ten, or whether he works before ten at all. But yet it is quite possible to distinguish the two kinds of teaching in their results. If an Englishman in India were to enter a Mahomedan school, and promise the master, at the end of the year, ten rupees for every boy in the school who could work decimal fractions, could it be said that he was paying the man to teach Mahomedanism? The State might easily examine into the efficiency of the civil teaching, pay the master for that, and leave the denominations to take care of the religious teaching. It is true that in this way the State would improve the religious teaching also, but only as the result of making the children more intelligent, and procuring a more efficient master. If, indeed, the school ought not only to be a means of giving religious instruction, but also of making proselytes, there would be some force in the inference of the Voluntary party. If a Mahomedan school were established here for the purpose of converting English children, any encouragement to the school, direct or indirect, would be an encouragement to the religious purposes of the school. But that this ought to be the object of the school neither Independents nor Baptists would allow, — and, indeed, the Baptists would earnestly deny.

But, whether the argument be logically sound, the principle on which it rests does not express the feeling of this country. England has never admitted the principle that public money may not be spent for religious purposes. It is natural that religious communities which are not established should consider all religious establishments as evil; just as religious communities which are established think some religious establishment a duty. But the English seem not disposed to commit

themselves to the abstract propositions on either side. They have supported an Established Church for centuries; if they support it less heartily now, it is only because its results do not seem so commensurate with its cost. Assuredly they will not be prevented from doing a great public good if the way be made clear, and the only obstacle be the abstract doctrine that the State ought not to spend money for religious purposes.

In order to maintain their ground, the Voluntaries must make out that the work of educating the community can be done without State assistance, and that the funds for the purpose can, and will, be supplied, either by the charity of the wealthy or by the exertions of the parents.

Those who would rely on charity point to the history of all the great movements for promoting education, both past and present. First, the Grammar Schools were founded by the same religious impulse as that which produced the Reformation. The foundation of these schools lies nearly between the years 1500 and 1800, and proceeded most actively about the middle of that period. The statutes of all these schools bear upon their face the evidence of the feeling from which they sprung. The religious teaching always occupies a prominent place among their avowed objects. They were intended to make children Christians quite as much as to make them learned. If the founder had not been animated by religious zeal, it seems improbable that the schools would ever have been founded at all. Next in order came the Charity or Blue-coat Schools. The foundation of these schools may be said to begin towards the latter end of the seventeenth century, and to have come to its greatest activity towards the end of the eighteenth. These schools are also unquestionably the fruits of religious zeal. In all of them, religious teaching occupies the first, if not the largest, place. And those which have been founded in more modern times are often distinctly connected with some religious community, and have not only a religious, but a denominational character. Lastly, almost within the present century has commenced the foundation of a third class of schools—the elementary,—and the impulse which created these is certainly not yet exhausted. This impulse, too, is unquestionably religious, as is proved by the immense number of denominational schools. Under this impulse, besides the few schools intended for civil teaching only, 12,708 distinctly religious schools had come into existence by the 1st of March, 1851, and out of these 4604 were founded between 1841 and 1851. These schools were then educating 1,188,786 scholars of both sexes, while the highest compu-

tation would only give 3,015,405 as the number of children who ought to have their names on school-books. If religious zeal has founded the great mass of all the institutions for education in the country,—if religious zeal is so active that half a century has provided the means of educating more than half the children that need it,—it seems not unreasonable to expect that a little patience would enable the same zeal to finish the work.

But the answer to all this is supplied by the very facts adduced. The Grammar Schools were founded by religious zeal, and were left to religious zeal to manage. More than seven hundred of these schools are now in existence. What is the use of them? It would not be too much to say, that at least three-fourths of the number are useless. It is not easy to draw the line above which efficiency may be said to begin. But it is assuredly under the mark to assume, that if five hundred were abolished to-morrow, not the slightest ill effect would be produced on the education of the country. Their income from endowments (and this does not include the public nor the cathedral schools) amounts to more than £150,000. It is notorious that in numbers of instances the resources have been wasted by neglect and mal-administration. Good management might double the income, would surely increase it by half. The increase that might be obtained, and at least half of what now remains, are entirely wasted. They do not teach the upper classes; a few of the larger among them and the public schools have monopolized that. They do not teach the middle classes; the teaching which they have to offer has prevented that. They are mere encumbrances. And why? For want of organization; for want of that organization which the State, or some equivalent centre, alone could have supplied. These schools—each working independently of all the rest, shut out from the influence of public opinion, with no power to adapt their statutes to the changing requirements of the time—at last lost all definiteness of purpose, and became useless, not from bad management, but from want of management. The few that have retained their value as places of education have retained it by the accident of possessing scholarships or exhibitions which affiliated them to the Universities. To them the Universities supplied, though in an imperfect manner, the definiteness of aim which was essential to their life. The rest, founded at a time when Greek and Latin included all possible education, and lasting into a time when Greek and Latin are useless to all who cannot go to Oxford or Cambridge, have almost perished, simply for want of something to do. And

having almost perished because they were made quite independent of the State, they are now looking to the interference of the State for their only chance of revival.

The Charity Schools, with an income still remaining of £141,385, have suffered the same fate, and for the same reason. They were even in a worse position than the Grammar Schools. The master of a Grammar School, even if not directly connected with the Universities, yet looked to them as the authority to guide his labours. After a school had ceased to send boys to Oxford or Cambridge, the boys were still taught as if they were to go there. The object, if not worth attainment, yet for a long time remained sufficiently defined. But the master of a Charity School had no such object defined before his eyes. The rules of the school might, perhaps, prescribe vaguely what he was to teach. But he had no pattern to show how he was to teach it, no standard by which he could test whether he was teaching it. Success in life is always a vague test of the preparations made for it, but is especially vague when applied to a school, since it depends on so much with which a school has nothing to do. The regular visits of an examiner, the examination of his school, and a public report on it, competition with other schools for prizes, would have given him a precise aim. But he had it not. And a vast number of these schools are now useless, and worse than useless, because they offer clothing to the scholars, and thus attract within their walls many who might learn something elsewhere, and will learn nothing there.

The elementary schools are springing up with marvellous rapidity. This rapidity, though not perhaps just now equal to what it has been, is yet far beyond the results of the early efforts. And at what date did this acceleration commence? Precisely when the Government began to take active measures to stimulate and organise the zeal of the religious communities. Nearly, if not quite, half the elementary schools now existing, have been founded since the establishment of the Committee of Council in 1839. The religious action has been, in fact, to a great extent, the mask behind which the influence of the Government has been at work. When Sir James Shuttleworth commenced his operations, he found (as his failures in 1839 and in 1843 would have been enough to prove, if proof had been needed) that the time was not yet ripe for legislation, nor even for independent action by the executive. It was necessary to lay hold on some popular impulse, to give it guidance, and inspire it with energy, and compel it to labour for the public good. No impulse, except religious zeal, had the independent strength necessary for the purpose.

Religious zeal was therefore made the driving-wheel of the machine. The Government defined its own aim so as to be in thorough harmony with the force on which it intended to rely. No schools were to be aided which did not embody religious teaching as part of their system. The Archbishop was to have a veto on the appointment of inspectors of Church Schools. The feelings of the dissenting communities were to be consulted in the appointment of inspectors of Dissenting Schools. Religious liberty was to be so scrupulously respected that the Government was not to interfere, except indirectly, with the management, discipline, or instruction. Founders of schools were, in fact, to be fettered by no conditions except such as were necessary to secure permanent efficiency. In this way the Government purchased the aid of the religious communities, by incorporating their object with its own. One difficulty might still have appeared to remain. The great incentive to private efforts on behalf of education was the soreness of the need and the absence of all means to supply it. This incentive would be entirely destroyed if the Government were to offer to supply deficiencies. Much that has been done, and has been done with ease, would assuredly have been declared impossible, if such a declaration had been made a title to claim aid from the State. There might seem reason to fear that, if the Government had offered to aid religious communities in proportion to their need, the popular impulse would be checked before the Government was strong enough to act alone. How this difficulty was overcome has been already indicated. Instead of making its aid proportional to the needs of the religious communities, the Government made it proportional to their success. The more they would do, the more the Government would help them. In this way the grants from the Committee of Council acted as a most powerful stimulus. For there is no greater incentive to exertion than aid which ensures a speedy attainment of what without aid would hardly be attained at all. The government grants, small as they sometimes were in comparison with the voluntary subscriptions, were so regulated as to convert the fair into the good, and the good into the excellent. For the government aid must not be measured by money. The Government could give what no money could have purchased—organization. The visits of the inspectors, the published reports, the examinations and appointments of pupil-teachers, the examinations and certificates of masters,—these give a concerted action and a definite aim to the whole work of all the schools, which no power short of Government could have given. Is it matter of wonder that, pushed by this powerful help, guided

by this steady control, the religious communities should have sprung forward in the cause which they had chosen with a rapidity which has astonished themselves? or can it be maintained, that if the aid of the Government were now withdrawn, there would be no relaxation of energy, no diminution of results? The fact is, that even schools which have received no public aid in money, have yet shared with the rest in the fruits of that guidance which the action of the Government has impressed on the whole movement,—their standard of efficiency has been raised, their methods have been improved, the zeal of their supporters has been stimulated.

Aided and guided by the Government, the religious communities have latterly done much; and still aided and guided they may do more. But if the history of attempts to educate the people proves anything, it proves that ultimate success in such attempts demands a force more steady, more enduring, more definite in purpose, than can be supplied by religious zeal. The resources supplied by religious zeal are liable to great fluctuations. Religious zeal wavers between enthusiasm and indifference; it is drawn off by new objects; it is depressed by great commercial crises. And schools, above most other institutions, are damaged by fluctuations; they suffer both from the prospect of future and from the effects of past failure. A real system of education for the country at large cannot rest on so uncertain a foundation.

Many of the Voluntary party, however, profess to look upon the efforts of the religious communities as merely provisional. The Baptists, in particular, maintain that the duty of education cannot permanently devolve on any but the parents, and anticipate a time when, partly, perhaps, by a rise in wages, but chiefly by greater self-denial, the parents will be able to do the whole work. They look upon a permanent provision for education as converting the labouring class, *pro tanto*, into paupers, and argue that it would break down the strength of domestic ties.

The argument founded on the danger of pauperizing the labourers is a mere mistake: to give a man that which morally lowers him has a tendency to pauperize him; if he is encouraged in idleness or in improvidence he is injured. But to give him what elevates his mind and character can never pauperize any one. And there can be no question that the whole family is improved and raised by the real education of the children. Education is one of the few charities that is perfectly safe. Food and clothing may often do as much harm as good. Money left to be given away in bread is almost invariably a source of real mischief, and such charities

ought to be abolished by law. For there is nothing in the gift to lift the receiver above what he was before; if he has obtained it by idleness or folly, his idleness or folly becomes justified by the treatment. And not a few districts might be indicated, which have been positively demoralized by such bequests. But no neighbourhood ever yet was demoralized by the presence of a well-managed free-school. That it may not be advisable to take off from the parents all obligation to assist in the education of their children, is another question. But to expect them to bear the whole burden is to postpone National Education at least a century.

It may, perhaps, be possible for those who are in receipt of fifteen or eighteen shillings a week in wages to spare enough for the education of their children; though those who have observed how very difficult it is in any class of society to re-adjust the ordinary details of expenditure will be sceptical in regard to the possibility of such a result being speedily attained. But a large part of the population get no more in weekly wages than from seven to twelve shillings. And with them such a result is hopeless. If the labourers of this class are to educate their own children, without help either from the Government or from private charity, they can only be enabled to do so by a rise in wages.

The four counties of Cornwall, Devon, Dorset, and Somerset, may serve as a specimen of the needs of education among a rural population. In the schools under inspection in these counties (of which, be it remembered, not more than fifty-eight per cent. are reported to be satisfactory) the annual expenditure per scholar is 18*s.* 3¾*d.*; the grants from Government average 11*s.* 2½*d.* The total cost, therefore, of educating a child is 29*s.* 6*d.*; of this sum the parents at present pay 4*s.* 6*d.* If we take the school year at forty-five weeks, the school fees would amount to little more on an average than 1*d.* a week. It is, no doubt, possible that this might by judicious treatment be a little increased, and we may suppose it raised to 2*d.* a week, or 7*s.* 6*d.* a year. There still remains 22*s.* to be provided, and as the average number of children in a family is certainly above two and perhaps three, we must suppose wages increased by 66*s.* a year, or about 1*s.* 3*d.* a week. But such a rise in wages would not do what is needed. There are many most pressing demands which would take precedence of the children's schooling. The wages are so close upon the imperative requirements of nature that any increase would be largely and most justly absorbed in better food, warmer clothing, especially at night, and more comfortable dwellings. If, indeed, the parents could distinctly see the future welfare of their children to

depend on education, they might purchase it with much present self-denial. But though education is visibly a gain, it cannot be called, in that class, a necessary to life. Manual labour does not and cannot much depend on reading and writing; and the great mass of the children of the labouring class will have to live by manual labour. Parents of this class rarely see an instance of education visibly and unmistakably influencing success in life, and to a rare chance they cannot be expected to sacrifice much. It is probably a very moderate computation that, in order to obtain fifteen-pence a week from the parents in the rural districts, their wages must rise half-a-crown a week, and this rise, of course, must be universal. To wait for this is to wait indefinitely.

The Dean of Hereford, when at King's Somborne, professed to make his school almost, if not quite, self-supporting. He taught all the children precisely alike, but called upon the parents to pay according to their means. Thus, he would admit a labourer's child for twopence a week, but would perhaps make a shoemaker pay sixpence, and a farmer one shilling. This was an admirable expedient for raising money, and as a provisional measure for an exceptional case, might be allowed to pass. But, considered as a national plan, it will not bear five minutes' examination. It is, really, nothing but a rate levied on the richer parents. If the school costs an amount equivalent to sixpence a child, and Farmer Sandford is called on to pay one shilling for his boy, in order that Labourer Strong may get his taught for twopence, it is clear that a rate is levied on Farmer Sandford to pay for the schooling of little Strong. Now, it may be quite fair to call on Farmer Sandford, not only to educate the little Sandfords, but to help in educating the little Strongs; but why are Farmer Thompson and Grazier Webber, who are very well off but have no children, to be exempt? A school-rate, levied only on those who have children of their own to educate, is the most unreasonable of propositions. To tax a man in proportion to the number of his children, to let the lightly-burdened go free and lay a double load on the back of the loaded, is what the most Malthusian chancellor of the exchequer would hardly venture to propose. The wonder is that the farmers of King's Somborne did not find out the trick and complain. But they were too much bewitched by the goodness of the school to think about the justice of the payments. And moreover, just or not, the rate being voluntary, could not be extracted from the lucky ones who had no children, and so no one could plead the injustice of not extracting it; but the same could not be said of a compulsory rate.

In short, it is not possible, within any reasonable time,

to make the poor raise the resources required for educating their children. But if it were possible to raise the resources, it still would not be possible to dispense with the interference of the Government. The Government, and the Government alone, can supply the necessary organisation, without which the elementary schools, like the charity schools before them, would never know their proper aim, or secure their proper management.

The Voluntary party would have us retrace our steps. The High Church, or Denominational party, would have us very nearly keep in our present track. This party probably contains the majority of the clergy, the High Church laity, the Roman Catholics, and a considerable number of Wesleyans. They are, on the whole, tolerably well satisfied with the present action of the Government. Most of them would, indeed, prefer more of what they call religious liberty—that is, greater liberty to the religious communities to obtain public aid in founding schools without any restrictions on their constitution. At present the Government refuses to assist any religious community in founding a school unless the laity of that community are associated in the management. This is felt as a grievance,—and there are other similar grievances; but, on the whole, it is impossible to deny that in purchasing the aid of the religious communities to promote education, Sir James Shuttleworth paid the price of handing over the schools to the Denominational system. And it is now pretty clear that any change from the present policy cannot be in a denominational direction, but will probably tend the other way. It is feared, and not without reason, that anything like a rate would involve control by ratepayers. This control might profess to follow the very rules which now protect the managers of schools against direct interference. And yet control by ratepayers close at hand would be a very different thing from control by the central government. The plan most favourable to the Denominational system would be to divide the country into districts, and levying a rate in each, to establish a council to administer the rate, exactly as the Committee now administers the grant of the House of Commons. This has actually been proposed; but even this has a dangerous aspect. At present the schools are usually supported from three sources,—the grants from Government, the children's fees, and the voluntary subscriptions. In return the Government exercises a general and very indirect control; the children receive their education; the subscribers have the chief management. But if a council of ratepayers be substituted for the Government, the ratepayers and the subscribers

would be the same persons. No one now thinks of his taxes as going towards supporting the school in his parish, but every one would know what became of his school-rate. Might not the rates gradually absorb the subscriptions? might not the subscribers gradually decline to subscribe privately and pay publicly at the same time? and would not the schools at last fall into the hands of the council of ratepayers for want of any private subscribers, and so lose their Denominational character?

This Denominational character the bulk of the party look upon as the only security for the religious character. The High Churchmen, being almost unanimously on this side, have given a tinge of their sentiments to the whole party. But there are very many included in it who are by no means men of extreme opinions, and would hardly accept the title of High Churchmen. And these rest their claims to a hearing, not on any extravagant pretensions, but on the broad grounds of the highest political expediency, and of liberty of conscience. They consider the Denominational system as the only one that is consistent with the right of religious liberty, and the only one that really acknowledges the importance of religious teaching.

The phrase religious liberty is ambiguous. By religious liberty may be meant the liberty of self-government by a religious community, or the liberty of religious action by an individual. These two senses, so far from being identical, are most often mutually opposed. To allow religious liberty to a community is very often only another phrase for allowing the oppression of the members by the leaders, of the quiet by the busy. The concession of religious liberty to a religious body, means the permission to exercise their own laws and their own discipline over their own members; it means the permission to inflict any penalty not exceeding excommunication. Now, of what do these communities consist, and how are they governed? They generally consist, first, of a considerable portion of steady, but not very eager adherents, who either belong to the sect by birth, or have found in its worship for one reason or another a sort of religious resting-place for their lives; and, secondly, of a much smaller body of warm partizans, who are what they are by conviction, and who take the lead by virtue of their greater zeal and activity. The former are very often earnest but quiet Christians. Among them, indeed, are to be found a great variety, from the lukewarm or the worldly, who join a religious community because it is respectable to do so, to the devout but retired saint, who abstains from any leading position out of humility or modesty. The smaller and busier section, however, look on themselves, and

are looked on by a sort of tacit consent of the rest, as the truly religious. Few observe the depth and force of religion sometimes to be found in the careful discharge of the duties of the day. The religious impulse which, like a dumb instinct, moves some men unconsciously through a quiet round of daily labour, seems mechanical in comparison with the fervent devotional life which appropriates to itself every ejaculation of St. Paul. Yet these men, who study to be quiet and to do their own business, must always be the large majority in any healthy religious community of long standing. And what do these men want? Chiefly, no doubt, to be let alone. They want to take as much of the religious system in which they find themselves, or which they have joined, as suits their religious need, and no more. One man likes the Wesleyan minister's sermons, but does not want the class-leader's exhortations, or the public confession of experiences. Another likes the Church Service, but cannot agree with the clergyman's notions, and will not join in any of his plans. Another likes the clergyman's conversation, but does not like his preaching, and will more gladly come to church when there is no sermon. There is a great variety in taste, in feeling, in opinion. But all this class agree in a wish to be left to themselves, to select their spiritual food by their own experience of its utility. It would be the grossest mistake to call them irreligious. We may, if we please, rank them below the others. We may think of the more brilliant or the more stirring characters as the waiting virgins or the active servants of the last triad of parables. And we may class these as the dumb sheep who will be quite astonished at the last day to find that what they have done for their fellow-men out of pure kindness of heart they have really done for Christ. But wherever we may class them, they are too valuable a body in every religious community to make it expedient that their rights should be neglected. And these are the men whose religious liberty is in danger when the religious liberty of the denominations is unrestricted.

These men are to be found in every sect, but they are peculiarly numerous in the Church. Partly the connexion with the State compels an amount of toleration which could not otherwise be obtained, partly the Church herself, whatever may appear on the surface, still retains her peculiarly English character. It is, indeed, the Church's large toleration of this class of men, quite as much as the piety of many of her members, and much more than her distinctive teaching, that constitutes her chief hold upon the nation; and nothing would more rapidly and utterly ruin the Church as a national institution than such a restoration of her corporate religious liberty

as would enable her officers to meddle with these apparently cool partizans. At present the Church of England is nearly, if not quite, the most tolerant religious body on the face of the earth. In the Church of England, if nowhere else, a Christian knows of a spiritual home which will give him a worship, and a guide, and the Sacraments, without forcing his conscience in the smallest particular: no one asks his opinions; no one has the right of prying into his conduct; no priest can demand his confession; no elder or deacon can censure his dress, his habits, or the management of his household. He does not feel responsible for the character of the worship at church, as the members of a Dissenting congregation must to a certain extent feel responsible for the worship at their meeting-house. He must be a notorious evil liver before he can be deprived of the Communion. Almost every other religious body in this country has something in some slight degree corresponding to the Roman Catholic confessional. But the Church, in respect to her laity, is absolutely tolerant. In this toleration is her greatest strength. This toleration enables her members to unite feelings of attachment and respect with the sense of perfect freedom. The Dissenter generally looks upon the body to which he belongs, not as something above him to be honoured, but as something in which he bears a part. The religious Churchman feels for the Church more what a grown-up son feels for a mother,—not submission of judgment, but affection of heart. He agrees, of course, with the outline of her doctrines, and very often he goes far beyond general agreement, and holds on conviction every detail of her distinctive teaching; but even then the characteristic of his attachment is much rather a sense of belonging to her family and owing much to her influence, than a readiness to maintain all her formularies. Hence the Church includes among her attached members a large body, remarkable for the union of quietness with earnestness, but by no means prepared to maintain details of doctrine, or to resist changes of discipline, or to press into prominence what is commonly meant by distinctive —that is, in reality, controverted—points of teaching. To exclude this body from the Church's operations would be a great mistake; to oppress them, a still greater.

The distinction between the religious liberty of a communion and the religious liberty of an individual becomes immediately practical when applied to schools. If absolute liberty were granted to religious communities, several would found schools in which the management would be entrusted entirely to the religious leaders, as such, and the children would be instructed in distinctive religious formularies, or not admitted at all. If

religious liberty were reserved to individuals, the management of every school would be open to all members of the denomination to which the school belonged, and the parents of the scholars would be permitted to withdraw their children from any part of the teaching without withdrawing them from the rest. The Denominational Party have already contested both these points with the Government. The celebrated management clauses of 1847 were in some degree an attempt on the part of the Committee of Council to defend the religious liberty of individuals against the community to which they belonged. The High Church Party would have founded schools to be governed by the clergy alone; the Government refused to consider the religious leaders as identical with the religious body, and insisted on the admission of the laity. The Government, after making very many serious concessions in detail, refused to give way on the broad principle, and the management clauses still remain the condition on which Denominational schools can be founded with the help of public money. The other, and much more important point—the liberty of the parents to withdraw their children from any part of the teaching, has never been pressed by the Government, though often recommended. Perhaps the insertion of it in Sir John Pakington's Bill may now make it an important matter of discussion.

If, therefore, religious liberty may be pleaded by the Denominational Party, it may be equally and much more forcibly pleaded against them. How can that be called religious liberty which often compels a poor man to choose between having his child taught what he disapproves, and not having him taught at all? It often happens that a few Dissenters are to be found in a parish of Churchmen; it often happens that a number of Dissenters, too poor to found a school, are to be found in a parish with a few wealthy Churchmen intent upon converting them; it sometimes happens that the clergyman alone can command the needful resources, while all the parishioners are Dissenters; it sometimes happens that Churchmen do not approve of some parts of the *Catechism*. It would be religious liberty to treat the school as we treat the Church. The custom of our Church allows a man to worship in the church, though he never comes to the Communion; or to have his child baptized, though he never comes to church; or to be married in church, though he usually attends the meeting-house. The custom of our Church refuses to draw a precise line between those who belong to her and those who do not; and that custom is to thousands the greatest of blessings. A man is allowed to take as much or as little of the Church Ser-

vice as he thinks good for himself. It would be religious liberty to allow him to take as much or as little of the school as he might think good for his children. If, indeed, the school be entirely supported from private resources, those who pay have an absolute right to govern. But if public money be given, the State is bound to see that the religious liberty of the Denominations be not made a liberty to oppress. It is quite true that very many clergymen, acting thoroughly in harmony with the tolerant spirit of the Church, practically admit the children of Dissenters without imposing on them obnoxious teaching. But this is a matter of favour, not of right; and in any national system the religious liberty of the labouring classes cannot be left as a matter of favour.

The same reasoning which inverts the argument founded on the right of religious liberty, takes away all the force of the argument founded on the importance of religious teaching. It is a mere exaggeration to say that religious teaching imperatively demands a denominational system; it is not true in any denomination,—it is least of all true in the Church. It is not true that the religious leaders of any denomination are the only, or the most truly religious men in it; it is an exaggeration to say that schools can be religiously managed by them, and by them alone. The Denominational system may perhaps, on the whole, be the best way of securing religious teaching, but it is not the only way, and there is a point beyond which it ceases to be so much a security for religious as for doctrinal teaching. Doctrinal teaching is always attended with the liability of leaving a deeper impression of religious rivalry than of religious duty; but not to say much of that danger (which is not, perhaps, very great), to lay so much stress on the doctrinal instruction of children is a mere mistake. It is not really possible in a Protestant Church to form the opinions of children, whether by *Catechisms*, or by anything else. Nor would a child who had learnt the *Catechism* be more likely on that account to remain a member of the Church in after life if circumstances pulled him another way. Regular attendance at church has a very considerable effect in making children grow up Churchmen; for the beauty of our Services gains by familiarity, and those who have been accustomed to another worship find it long before they can feel at home in ours. But attendance at church is now connected with the Sunday-school, and little with the day-school. The clergyman has in reality as great a hold upon the school as he ever can use if he shares in the management, and has thus the right of frequent and authoritative entrance. He certainly will not find that his power over his own flock is practically lessened by the presence

of Dissenting children. Those who argue that teaching must be denominational in order to be religious, seem to forget that the school is not the world. The teacher of the *Catechism*, it is supposed, cannot teach it if there be in the same school at a different hour, or at the other end of the room, children to whom it may not be taught. He requires, in order to make his teaching successful, to surround himself and his class with a fictitious belief that there are none except the very wicked who do not agree with all that he is saying. But if he could create this fiction, it would be destroyed the moment the children got home. There each will find father and mother treating the Dissenter next door as a Christian, though the said Dissenter strongly objects to the *Catechism*, and does not hesitate to state his objection. In fact, the purely Denominational system of teaching is possible in a monastery, or in a sect where teachers and parents believe in the infallibility of their formularies, but not in a church founded on the right, and acknowledging the duty of private judgment.

Besides the oppressive character essentially inherent in purely Denominational Schools, there are two real objections to the present system which no art has yet discovered the way to elude: one is the impossibility of making it cover the country, the other is the financial injustice of its operation.

The grants are now made to meet corresponding local exertions; but there are districts where to wait for local exertions is hopeless. Some are really too poor; some are so out of the range of ordinary influences that their resources can never be reached. Religious zeal is already beginning to show signs that it can do no more without some still stronger stimulus than has yet been applied to it. Though the demand for well-trained schoolmasters is as great as ever, the rapid growth of training-schools has already been checked, and those which stand find yearly greater difficulty in procuring their income, and press yearly with an increasing weight upon the Education Grant. The same signs of slackness can be read in other parts of the movement. And the Capitation Minute of 1853 is a sort of confession on the part of the Committee of Council that the old policy is failing. Religious zeal, in fact, has reached, or nearly reached, the limit to which religious rivalry could push it; and religious zeal without religious rivalry is a much weaker power. There still remains more than half the work to do in extent, and considerably more than half in degree. The towns have done as much as this system will get them to do, and yet there is much improvement wanted in the towns; extensive rural districts have done nothing, and will do nothing.

Even of what has been done a very great part represents the religious zeal, not of the nation at large, but of the clergy in particular. Of the 10,550 Church Schools erected before the 1st of March, 1851, it would be a moderate computation to say that half were due to the unwearied personal exertions and personal sacrifices of the clergy, and the clergy alone. The first thing to which a clergyman looks on taking charge of a parish is now always the school. What has been done, and what remains to do, and how best it can be done, fill his thoughts morning, noon, and night. By begging among his wealthy friends, by frequent appeals to his parish, by begging from the Committee of Council, by bazaars and fancy sales, by public meetings and collections after speeches, by every permissible device for raising money, he gets together what he can, and at last throws in a considerable sum, which he can ill spare, out of his own pocket, and so gets his school built. The maintenance of it often costs him almost an equal amount of personal labour year after year. The improvements forced upon him by the Committee of Council make the weight still heavier. Very often, the first enthusiasm which helped him to build the school wears away, and the necessary expense is turned into a burdensome school-rate, levied on him alone. In spite of all this, the clergy have not yet given up the task. But if there is no limit to their self-devotion, there is a limit to their powers, and that limit is not far off. Without more aid from the State they cannot do much more.

To give more aid on the present system leads inevitably to a burden which the country ought not to undertake. The present system has stimulated local efforts almost to straining. If the ratio borne by the grants to the subscriptions were increased, a very large amount of money would immediately be absorbed by the shrinking of local subscriptions, without any result upon education at all. The capitation grant now made to country schools has already met with that fate. A considerable proportion of it goes to schools which were doing very fairly before, and are not doing more now; the money has simply relieved the pockets of the subscribers. And a similar issue will follow any attempt to grant money on more easy terms than before. Thus, for instance, to double the proportion which the grants towards the masters' salaries now bear to the subscriptions would not improve the salaries, but simply relieve the subscribers. To get a master £30 from the Government the subscribers must now subscribe £30, to get him £20 they must subscribe £20; but if they could get him £40 by subscribing £20, those who now subscribe £30 would subscribe £20, and the Government would spend £10 more without any

effect whatever on the school. The same result would follow any other similar relaxation of the present conditions. Ground would be gained, no doubt, but it would be gained at a frightful expense. It would be necessary to add 100 per cent. to the annual vote in order to add £25 per cent. to the effect produced.

The other objection to the present system is its injustice. The taxes are levied on the whole country; the poor districts pay as much in proportion as the rich, and if the money is to be returned to them, the poor ought at least to get a share. But the system of rewarding local exertions necessarily entails the refusal of all aid to districts which are really too poor to make any such exertions at all. The remedy might seem to lie in reversing the policy hitherto adopted, and making grants proportional, not to the amount, but to the deficiency of local subscriptions. In this way the Government might help those who cannot help themselves. But here the old difficulty recurs. The Government has no means of distinguishing between those who cannot help themselves and those who will not. The results would certainly be that the grants would kill the subscriptions. It is easy to talk of giving only to poor districts; but to draw a line in such cases is inconceivably difficult. Every one acquainted with the working of an office knows that the moment exceptional cases are admitted to special favour, every case becomes exceptional. The barriers erected to guard the exception melt away one by one. Places which on the present system raise money enough to go on with would speedily plead total inability to raise any; in fact, the end of this policy is to transfer the burden entirely to the revenue. Now, a burden which could easily be borne while it was local would be quite unbearable if made central; for schools cannot really be managed by a central power: they require, more than any other kind of institution, efficient management on the spot. A school depends for its success more on the local management than on the master, and there are more instances of good schools with first-rate management and second-rate masters than with first-rate masters and second-rate management. But if the schools are to be managed by local authorities, no mistake would be more fatal than to allow these authorities to dip their fingers into the public purse. Such a system sacrifices at once every safeguard for economy. The State of Massachusetts in America once transferred the burden of relieving casual poor from the local rates to the general revenue. In twenty-seven years the amount expended on this alone was multiplied by five. They began, as in such cases men always begin, with the most stringent regulations

for proper supervision. But no regulations could bear the constant pressure. The whole country seemed to be combined against the Government. The same difficulty is felt by the Council Office even now. Even now the most necessary rules are accused of unnecessary rigidity. And in all probability the country at large would gladly welcome a laxity that must end in an enormous increase of the burden. The reason is obvious. People who are administering a rate feel every sixpence that they spend; people who are administering a grant from a tax know that a hundred pounds wasted will not make a difference of half a farthing apiece in their individual taxation. Waste will not be made on purpose, of course; but the vigilance which alone can prevent waste will be lulled to sleep. A tax of five millions would probably be required in twenty years to do the work which might have been accomplished by a rate of two.

Local rates locally administered are the only resource to which we can look for finishing what has been begun. Local rates may be made to meet both the objections urged against the present system. It is obvious that local rates may be made to cover the country; it is not so obvious, but it is equally true, that local rates worked conjointly with a central fund may be made to obviate the present injustice. It is, however, singular that Sir John Pakington, who clearly saw the present injustice, did not see his way to the remedy. 'The grants,' he said (17th of March, 1855), 'which are annually voted by Parliament are given, under the Committee of Council, to rich districts instead of to poor ones. The minute under which the grants are issued requires that a certain proportionate sum should be provided by the locality, and the consequence is that the poorest districts, which are in most need of assistance, get nothing.' He followed this by comparing together four poor parishes in London which, having an aggregate population of 138,900, had received £12 0*s.* 8*d.*, and four rich parishes which, having an aggregate population of 50,000, had received £3908. And he asked 'if it were the policy or the intention of the House, in voting so large a sum of money as it annually does for the purposes of education, that the rich only should be benefited, while the poor had nothing.' But though he stated the objection so clearly, his Bill left the evil nearly as it was. Mr. Henley was able to reply (3rd of May, 1855) by asking how Sir John Pakington proposed to remedy the injustice, and pointing out that the Bill provided no such remedy. 'His right honourable friend,' he said, 'had complained because Bethnal Green and other places he had referred to had no share in the grant which they were taxed to furnish. Well, his right honourable friend said to those places, 'You

have no grant, and you have no school; therefore, I will not give you any money, but I will give you liberty to tax yourselves.' That seemed an odd way of remedying the injustice, and he should have thought that the best mode of removing that wrong would be to give the Government larger sums to distribute, in order that they might assist those poorer places.' Sir John Pakington might have said something in reply to this, no doubt; but still he could not altogether elude the force of Mr. Henley's remark. It *is* a strange remedy for the injustice to levy a rate on the poorer districts, and thus compel them, out of their poverty, to do for their children what other districts do without compulsion, out of their wealth. But, meanwhile, the remedy which Mr. Henley himself proposes is impossible with a system of voluntary contributions, and becomes possible only with a rate. While the contributions are voluntary, the Government can never distinguish between those who cannot and those who will not give; when the contributions are compulsory, and are based on ascertainable property, the difficulty vanishes. Grants to meet deficiencies in subscriptions would kill subscriptions, for no man would subscribe if a refusal would bring a grant. Grants to meet deficiencies in rates would not kill rates, for a man is not allowed to choose whether he will pay his rates or not. In a law compelling a rate, a maximum might be easily fixed, above which the rate per pound in any district should not rise. If the maximum rate failed to provide efficient schools, a grant might supply the deficiency. Thus the poorer districts might get assistance without any danger that the assistance given would act as an incentive to neglect local duties.

In short, it may be assumed that all who would receive State assistance at all really feel that to local rates we must come at last. The Denominational party would gladly put off the time as long as possible, to increase their hold upon the schools. They, and they alone, are at present gaining ground. And the introduction of a rate will be the beginning of a severer struggle than they have yet encountered.

Those who would at once lay the foundation of a national system have two problems to solve—what is to be the guiding principle of the system, and how are the existing schools to be taken into it?

Sir John Pakington's Bill proposed to take the existing schools into his system just as they are, without further interference with their management, discipline, or instruction, than that they should consent to receive any child sent to them by the school authorities of the district, and allow the parents of any child to withdraw it from any part of the instruction

without withdrawing it from the rest. He proposed to make boroughs and poor law unions the school districts, and to give every such school district the power of electing a school committee to manage education and make grants to schools out of the borough fund or poor rate, to supply deficiencies in their revenues. He proposed to retain the Committee of Council, partly as a court of appeal in certain cases, partly as administering a central fund on the present system. This would provide for the existing schools.

New schools he proposed to provide by empowering the school committees to build them, unless, within sixty days after notifying their intention to do so, they were forestalled by private subscribers. Schools so built by private subscribers could take their place by the side of the schools now existing. Schools built by the school committees would be Denominational schools of a very modified character. They would in all ordinary cases be considered to belong to the Church of England; and on that account the master would be required to be a member of the Church; and the management would be intrusted to a committee nominated by the school committee of the district, and consisting, to the extent of two-thirds, of members of the Church. But if it should appear that the majority of the inhabitants were not members of the Church, the school district committee might refer the matter to the Committee of Council, and the Committee of Council might determine to what denomination the school should belong. These new schools Sir John proposed to make free of all charge to the parents. Whether under his Act the existing schools were to become free is not clear, but he seemed to intend it.

It is obvious that the great aim of this Bill was, not to give the best possible education, nor to create the best possible machinery, but to make the best use of existing instruments. To accept whatever already existed, and to do the best that could be done with it, is the beginning, middle, and end of the plan. The Committee of Council was accepted with all its present system. The schools already established were accepted, and so was the still unchecked impulse to build more like them. The civil position of the Church was acknowledged, and so was the fact that in some districts the Church is outnumbered by the Dissenters. The very rate itself which the Bill proposed to levy was not to be a new rate, but an addition to the poor-rate; and the school districts, not new districts, but those already created by the Poor Law. The principle thus adopted is too thoroughly in harmony with English politics to admit of question. All criticism, hostile or friendly, must

turn on the details. Five points seem to demand attention, either because they have provoked attack, or because they deserve it. First, the permitted withdrawal of children from the religious instruction; secondly, the grants from the rates to supply deficiencies in the revenue of the schools; thirdly, the modified Denominational character not only retained in existing, but extended to future schools; fourthly, the abolition of the payment of fees by the parents; fifthly, the adoption of the Poor Law divisions of the country.

The permission to withdraw the children from the religious instruction is the one only means of making the Denominational system just; it is the inevitable price which that system must pay if it is to become in any form the national system. That the nation shall consent to establish elementary schools for the poor, such that the parents shall be liable to lose all control over the religious teaching of their children, is impossible. Nor can it be said that this withdrawal clause is an untried enactment, the issues of which upon education no man can foresee. It has already been tried in the workhouse schools by law, in very many parochial schools by the consent of the clergyman. In the workhouses every one knows the result: the Roman Catholic children are generally withdrawn from the chaplain's religious teaching, the other children very rarely. In the country schools the liberty allowed is sometimes taken by the parents, sometimes purposely arranged by the clergyman. But in neither case is it found to interfere with that religious influence over the school which is involved in the clergyman's retaining an authoritative voice in the management. The same results would have followed in the country generally if Sir John Pakington's Bill had passed. In the towns, indeed, the case might be different; but in the towns each denomination would be sure to have its own school. In the country it would be rarely found that the parents had such an objection to the clergyman's doctrine as to make them willing to forego the advantage of his care.

The Church has more to gain from the adoption of the withdrawal clause than any other religious body; for the Church has one great advantage over all other denominations in her territorial organization. She alone covers the country. In every parish the Church has at least one officer, the clergyman, who possesses qualifications considerably above the average for superintending education. He belongs himself to the educated classes, and yet his profession leads him to be constantly among the labourers. He must know what they really want, and if he would consent to take charge of their education, in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred, no other

man is so fit as he to do it; and in ninety-cases out of a hundred, if the withdrawal clause were part of the law, he would be invited to do it. But the cleygyman's help, valuable as it unquestionably is, would be bought too dear if the price be the sacrifice of individual liberty of conscience. There has certainly been a time when the country would have been content to cover the rural districts of England with Church schools, allowing the right of withdrawal. That time has not so far passed away but that, if Mr. Henley's party would join Sir John Pakington's, the Church might yet maintain the ground. And the general establishment of such schools, in which the clergyman's authority would be welcomed because of his superior knowledge of the business, while all jealousy would be prevented by the fullest toleration, would add largely to the Church's legitimate influence. But it is possible that a little more resistance from the Denominational Party will drive the nation to give up all hope of religious teaching, and set up Secular or Combined schools instead.

The mode in which Sir John Pakington would grant supplies out of the rates would be speedily fatal to the voluntary subscriptions. At present the schools are generally governed by committees representing the subscribers. The clergyman in a Church school, the religious minister in a school of any other denomination, is on this committee;—the rest are members elected by all subscribers of a certain amount. The subscriptions depend on the good-will of the subscribers; and the office of keeping them alive to their duty almost invariably devolves on the clergyman or minister. Now, Sir John Pakington's Bill makes the rate so nearly supplement all deficiencies, that the clergyman or minister would lose his chief plea; he could not say that a failure in subscriptions will ruin the school. But more than that, he would lose all inducement to plead; for if the subscribers cease to exist, the committee ceases with them and the management falls into his hands, and he must be a philosopher of a very high order if he would not rather manage the school by himself than have the aid of the committee. The issue in many rural districts would assuredly be that the subscriptions would cease, and the schools would be supported by rates, and managed by the clergyman or minister. That the subscriptions, at least in their present form, should cease, is no great evil; rates are more permament, more fixed, and more just than subscriptions. But that the subscribers should cease, is an evil. For the ratepayers, even when they had to pay for the school, would still not govern it. To make one party pay and the other govern would lead to interminable quarrels, if it had no ill effect beside.

The very modified Denominational character which Sir John Pakington proposed for future schools cannot be objected to on the score of intolerance. Nothing seems more fair than that, if the majority are not members of the Church, their school should not belong to the Church. And nothing would be more fair if the majority were to decide for themselves. But here the majority would be the labourers whose children needed education. The body to take cognizance of the matter in the first instance would be the ratepayers; and the body to decide the matter would be the Committee of Council. The result might be in strict accordance with the purest principles of reason, and yet not at all what the parents of the scholars would prefer. It is quite conceivable that a body of Churchmen would for many reasons prefer a constitution which would not introduce the clergyman. It is not only conceivable, but in many cases probable, that a body of Dissenters would prefer to have a Church school in order to get the clergyman's help. In spite of its toleration, Sir John Pakington's device in this respect appears clumsy. The probability, however, is that in most cases of dispute the point would not be allowed to come to a reference to the Committee of Council at all. There would be a race between the Church and the Dissenters, which should first build a private subscription school; and when it was built, it would be left for the ratepayers to maintain and the clergyman or Dissenting minister to govern.

The abolition of the children's fees Sir John Pakington defends by the example of America. But the analogy will not hold. In America the ratepayers send their own children to the schools; in England the ratepayers will do nothing of the kind. It is impossible, if it were desirable, to persuade the middle classes to mingle with the lower while the upper do not mingle with the middle. The education of the upper classes has distinctly separated itself from that of the rest of the nation. The middle classes will insist upon a similar relative position. This may be an evil. But unless members of Parliament would consent to send their own sons to these schools, the evil is incurable. Nor, again, in America has no evil been found to result from the freedom of the schools; the attendance is very irregular, and this irregularity is generally ascribed, by American writers, to there being no fees to pay. Lastly, America is a young country, with no reason to check the rapid growth of population; in England the population rapidly outruns the employment for it. It may do no harm in America to remove from parents part of the burden of their children; but England should not hastily follow such an example.

But the chief objection to this proposal is financial. The education of the whole labouring population is a very heavy

task,—the expense will not be less than thirty shillings a head per annum. The number in the schools ought to be at least two million and a half, requiring £3,750,000 a year. The endowments and other resources of that kind might perhaps make up £250,000. It is possible that voluntary subscriptions would raise this to £750,000. But there still remains £3,000,000 to provide. The parents already pay about £300,000. By good management and proper encouragement they might probably be induced to pay £900,000, or about 7*s.* 6*d.* a head. Is it prudent to throw away this help? Sir John Pakington would do more wisely not to put on the backs of the ratepayers more than is absolutely necessary; for of the £3,000,000 not more than £1,000,000, at the outside, could be well laid on the general revenue, and the remainder must be supplied entirely from the rates, unless the parents are to be called upon to help.

The adoption of the Poor Law divisions is right in principle. Parishes are not large enough to manage education well by themselves. The ratepayers of areas so small would necessarily elect on their school committees men who knew little of the subject, and whose whole aim would be the suppression of really effecient instruction. It has been questioned whether the association of the schools with the poor rate might not tend to unworthy feelings in the minds both of parents and of ratepayers. But the school committees would be a distinct body from the Poor Law guardians, and the advantages of adopting a division already existing and well known are more than enough to counterbalance the evil of a mere sentiment, which would soon wear out.

These are the difficulties in the way of Sir John Pakington. Lord John Russell would escape from most of them by the simple process of shifting them to other shoulders. He would throw the burden of determining the principle upon which schools are to be built and governed upon the ratepayers. By his Bill, any borough or parish might submit a scheme for education within its own limits to the Committee of Council, and if the said Committee approved, might proceed to put the scheme in force. The only restraint upon this freedom of local action was to be that, on the one hand, all schools were to read the Bible, and, on the other hand, Roman Catholic and Jewish children were to be excused from reading it, and Roman Catholic, Jewish, and Dissenting children were to be excused from learning any religious formulary to which their parents might object. All the three Bills are merely permissive,—and as a permissive Bill to prepare the way for something more definite, this plan has much to recommend it;

but if considered as a final settlement, it is open to grave objections.

In the first place, it either leaves the education of the people to chance, or puts an enormous power into the hands of the executive. Parliament is asked to legislate in the dark. The general character of the institution is defined to be such as has received the name of Comprehensive. But, beyond this, nothing is defined. Whether the schools are to be free or not,—whether the rates are to be granted to meet private subscriptions, or to meet the deficiencies of private subscriptions,—whether the Denominational character of the present schools is to be preserved, or they are to be ruined by the competition of rate-supported Comprehensive schools,—the determination of all this is to be left either to the executive for the time being, or to mere accident. It seems hardly consistent with the duties of the legislature of a country like this to leave to the chance action of separate localities, or to the control of a shifting body like the Cabinet, the ultimate determination of the principles upon which three-fourths of the people are to be educated. Education, to be good, ought to proceed upon a plan. The best form of school in one parish cannot really be determined without some reference to other parishes. Thus, for instance, one parish may prefer free schools; the next may require a weekly payment. The labourers would, of course, crowd from one into the other, and cause all manner of quarrels and annoyances in consequence. Whether free schools or unfree schools be the better, a mixture of both within near limits would assuredly be an evil. This need for systematic action pervades the whole work to be done. Systematic action requires a controlling power. To put this controlling power into the hands of the executive, with no directions whatever for its exercise, is to legislate more blindly for the lower classes than we should ever be content to legislate for ourselves. If Parliament legislates, thorough and public discussion exhibits the true grounds of the decisions adopted. But if the legislation be practically transferred to the Committee of Council, no one may know the reasons for a single regulation.

Nor is this indefiniteness the only fault of the Bill. The small area of the school districts would have a tendency to throw the management of the schools into unsafe hands. The school guardians would be men too near the poor to be wisely trusted with their interests. They would assuredly weigh every penny expended, not by the benefit to the learners, nor by the benefit to the nation at large, but by the benefit to themselves in particular. Nor are they sufficiently enlightened

even to make this last calculation, on a large scale, or on data drawn from distant results. How far intellectual education has a tendency to diminish theft and crimes against property, to improve the skill exhibited in ordinary labour, or to diminish pauperism, are considerations too far-fetched for the vestries of country parishes. Such vestries would be much more likely to regard with jealous fear any improvement of the labourer's condition which raised him nearer to themselves. The school at King's Somborne would be a beacon to warn them from dangerous courses. The idea of a clever lad from a cottage competing with success against a son of their own would fill them with anger. They would be much more likely to throw obstacles in the way of efficient education than to promote it.

Mr. Cobden avoided Lord John's faults at the expense of a worse fault by far;—he made his Bill impossible to carry. He proposed new school districts, to be determined by the Committee of Council. To each of these he would have given the power of making rates and electing a committee to administer the rates. He proposed to admit existing schools to the benefit of the rate, if they would exclude doctrinal teaching from four specified hours of every day, and allow children to attend during those four hours without attending at any others. He proposed to build new schools from the rates, and exclude doctrinal teaching from them altogether, but to assign times when such teaching might be communicated by other agencies. These new schools, and the existing schools that joined his system, he proposed to make altogether free of charge to the parents.

The chief objection to this scheme is, that it will not pass. The nation does not like the Combined Plan, at least in so secular a form. It might not be irreligious in working, but it has an irreligious look. It omits that sort of acknowledgment of religion which all Englishmen like to put on the face of their important acts. And this wish to acknowledge religion is not to be despised as hypocritical. It is never hypocritical, though the contrast between such acknowledgments and the practice which often accompanies them may often make it seem so. It is at any rate strong enough to compel statesmen to respect it. We may, perhaps, be driven, by the quarrels of the denominations, to accept secular teaching as better than nothing. But at present the nation is not convinced that we cannot do better.

Nor is it only the inborn feeling of Englishmen that Mr. Cobden is striving against. The denominations are in actual possession of the field. They have done ten times more than all their rivals. They can point to a long series of unwearied

labours. They have been stimulated by the government measures to such exertions, and those exertions have been crowned with such success, that many of them believe the hour of their absolute triumph to be at hand. And Mr. Cobden proposes, at one and the same time, to force upon them an unpalatable condition, and to put a peremptory stop to their future progress. Religious bodies which will not confine doctrinal teaching to certain hours, are to have their schools ruined by the competition of rate-supported free schools. Religious bodies that accept his hard terms are to be prevented, by the same competition, from erecting a single new school. How can Mr. Cobden expect to put a sudden stop to a popular impulse which has been founding schools at the rate of four hundred and fifty a year? Even if it be now somewhat slackened, the fire of their zeal is not extinct, and the slightest chance of his success would rouse a most angry opposition.

Sir John Pakington would be probably supported by many among the clergy, by the country gentry, by all the farmers who are favourable to education at all, and by a few of the middle classes in the towns. The bulk of the town middle classes would probably follow Lord John Russell, if he would more fully develop his principles. Mr. Cobden will chiefly find adherents in the manufacturing districts; but his is rather a local than a national party, and is formed by considerations of abstract principle rather than of any strong interest.

All these schemes are faulty, in three respects: they entirely put aside, both now and always, the right of the parents to a general control over the education of their children; they make no provision for bringing into useful action the great resources now wasted in the form of endowments; and they offer the middle classes no promise of a scheme of education for themselves.

It will seem mere enthusiasm to maintain that the labourers should have any voice in the management of the schools where their children are to be educated. The labouring class understand so little about education, their management of their children is often so palpably injudicious, their time is so taken up with the duties of providing daily bread for their families, that we quietly assume that they ought simply to send their boys and girls to be taught, and be thankful for what they can get. It has been tried, too, to give them a control, and it has not answered well. They quarrel instead of governing, and cannot be persuaded to see their own or their children's true interests. They meddle a great deal too much, and drive away good schoolmasters by foolish interference. They wish

their children to be taught what makes a show rather than what is really useful. Above all, they are foolishly impatient of allowing their children to be punished when it is deserved. If their liberty of conscience is protected, and they are allowed to withdraw their children from religious instruction of which they disapprove, that is as much as they can fairly claim. Some of these arguments are well founded. It would be a mere folly suddenly to take away the management of the schools from those who have founded them, and transfer it to the labourers. The labourers are not fit, as a body, to undertake the task. But though there is sufficient truth in these objections to make sudden changes undesirable, the general drift is no more than what the governing have always said, and always will say, to the governed. It is rarely possible to convince those who have power that the power would be better administered by other hands. It is still more difficult to convince them that, even if worse administered, it would more surely reach its end at last. Teachers of religion sometimes persecute because they do not recognize that the believer's error in matters of faith is 'opinion in the making.' So rulers refuse to trust the ruled, from not understanding that the people's misgovernment of their own affairs is government in the learning. And yet, if the labouring class are ever to learn any kind of self-government, the management of their children's education is the most within their reach. It is a matter of the deepest interest to them; there is not a sounder feeling in an Englishman's heart than his love for his children, and in no class is that love stronger than among the labourers. It is a business where mistakes rapidly and palpably show their fruits, even to the eyes of the most uninstructed. The labourers would never attempt to manage directly; for direct management their knowledge of education would not be sufficient; but they would be quite capable of choosing good managers to act for them. It is likely enough that they would make many mistakes,—but they would not long persist in mistakes whose consequences became so speedily visible. There is a sound bottom of good sense in the English character upon which statesmen may securely build; and in no class is good sense more strong than among the labouring men. They may be deceived upon questions which they do not understand,—but not long upon practical matters which can rapidly be brought to a practical test. There are foolish parents among them who would indulge their children too much. But there are foolish parents in every rank, and the proportion is not so overwhelmingly large among the labourers as to make it unsafe to put any power over education into their hands.

At present the labourers pay about a third of the expense of educating their children,—but they are practically excluded from all control. The charitable sell their charity at the dear rate of teaching what they will. On that footing, Sir John Pakington and Mr. Cobden are right in making the school free; if the poor are not to say how or what their children shall be taught, it is but just that they should pay nothing for it. It now not unfrequently happens that a labourer, paying *6d.* a week for three children, pays in this way more than £1 a year. When the school is managed by a committee, every subscription of 10*s.* a year, and sometimes every subscription of 5*s.* a year, gives the subscriber a vote in the election of a member of the committee. The labourer paying £1 ought to get, on the first scale, two, and on the second scale, four votes,—but he gets none at all. And yet he has more than a double interest, for he is staking not only his money, but his children.

If a fair annual fee for one child—say 7*s.* 6*d.* a year, or 2*d.* a week for forty-five weeks—were made the title to a vote, whether paid by a labourer in weekly, or by a subscriber in annual instalments, if every person so paying an annual fee were allowed to keep one child in the school, whether his own or any other person's, free of all further charge, the labourers would be enabled to take a part in the management of the schools without dislodging those who contributed from motives of charity. Since, of course, only those would obtain a right to vote who had regularly paid up their weekly fees, there would be a premium on steady payment,—steady payment would be at once a guarantee for respectability in the labourer, and a strong stimulus to regularity of attendance in the children; for it is well known that a child that has paid its 2*d.* on Monday is rarely absent during the week.

In this way the objections to rates, noticed above, would be entirely met. The rates would not kill the subscriptions; indeed, the ratepayers would eventually come to be a different class from the subscribers. The subscription would be generally paid, not to support the school, but to procure admission for a child; even the subscribers from the higher classes would most often subscribe in order to have the power of assisting their poorer neighbours by putting in their children. The present policy of the Committee of Council might be carried into the districts. Aid from the rates might be granted to meet the subscriptions, and thus the parents stimulated to make every exertion to do their duty to their children.

In this way, too, the religious difficulty in all future schools might be most easily got over. Let the subscribers (who

would include the more respectable of the parents) be empowered to elect on the managing committee a minister of religion to take charge of the religious teaching. In default of such express election, let that office and the corresponding seat on the committee go to the clergyman of the parish. The parents who belonged to the denomination that was in the minority might withdraw their children from the religious instruction, and no doubt the denominational leaders would find means to supply their needs. If there were sufficient population in the parish, different denominations would have, as now, different schools. If not, it is far better to put the choice in the hands of the parents than to give it either to the District Committee or to the Committee of Council.

Further, it is the perpetual complaint that parents are indifferent. This is sometimes accounted for by saying that the education is not what they need for their children,—sometimes by saying that, though it is valuable, they cannot be made to understand its value. In either case, there is no cure like putting the matter into their own hands. If the education is not what they need, they would be enabled to say what it ought to be; if they cannot appreciate its value, there is nothing which sharpens a man's appreciation like having the matter to be appreciated in his own control. Appreciation of the school would assuredly grow, and with that growth would grow much else most valuable—sense of responsibility in regard to their children, sense of the importance of education to their class,—a desire to push the interests of their school among themselves.

Nor would there be any difficulty in gradually introducing the principle into the schools that now exist. Let them be admitted into the system on the condition that Sir John Pakington proposes, of allowing the parents to withdraw their children from the religious instruction. But give a majority of the managers legal power to alter the constitution of their trust deed (and a very slight alteration would suffice), so as to admit the school-pence among the subscriptions and the parents among the subscribers; and let the grants from the rates be made proportional to the subscriptions. This gentle pressure would speedily induce many managers to admit the parents among the subscribers, and the example would gradually spread.

The second point above mentioned—viz., the necessity of making some use of the endowments already existing, has not escaped the notice of Parliament. A commencement has been made in creating the necessary machinery, by the Act appointing the Charitable Commission. This Commission is too limited in judicial and too weak in adminis-

trative power. It has too legal a character, and is too much tied down to the chancery doctrine of the *cy pres*. The *cy pres* has been so carefully guarded by our courts, that the chief benefits of nine endowments out of ten will be probably thrown away in order to preserve some regulation or other which has lost all meaning through change of time and circumstances, and which its author, if he were now alive, would often be the first to disavow. But an education bill cannot perhaps be made the vehicle of introducing important changes in the administration of so large and peculiar a kind of property. If the Charitable Commission is too weak, it must be amended by itself, and not in a rider to a bill upon another, though closely connected subject. Yet that is no reason for not introducing into the Education Bill very definite relations between the local authorities to be established for administering a school rate and the endowed schools within the district of each.

The number of schools 'not classical' reported on by the old Commission of Enquiry into Charities was 2190, and their income was then estimated at £141,385 2*s*. 6*d*. Besides this, a large number of charities not connected with individual schools, but intended for the furtherance of education, came under the same review, and the total amount of their income was found to be £19,112 8*s*. 8*d*. It is, however, believed that not a few endowments escaped the notice of the Commission. The income, therefore, of £150,497 11*s*. 2*d*., on which they reported, probably falls short of what might be discovered by a very vigilant search. And it is quite certain that this income is very much less than it might be, in consequence of mismanagement and neglect. A second commission for carrying out still further the purposes of the first was appointed in 1849, and proved by many instances the waste and gross misappropriation to which property of this kind was liable. It is not at all unlikely that good management might bring the revenues to £250,000, and it may be taken as certain that no extraordinary exertion is needed to make them £200,000.

To throw away such an income when proposing to saddle the country with a tolerably heavy rate would be absurd. And to prevent its being thrown away, the first thing to be done is obviously to bring everything connected with it to the light of day. In order, however, to bring matters of this sort to light, it is of little use to examine into them and publish the results in a Blue Book of thirty-eight folio volumes. The labours of the old Charity Commission laid an admirable foundation; their reports are an encyclopædia, from which the leading facts connected with almost every charity can always be extracted.

But no single board or department will deal satisfactorily with so vast a mass of details. If we are to wait till the present Charity Commissioners, with their two inspectors (and the Act allows them no more), have set all the schools right, their system will be antiquated long before it is concluded. What is wanted is the energetic action of interested local authorities. This money, if it is to be used at all, will save the pockets of the ratepayers. The ratepayers are on the spot, and have the best means of knowing what is needed. To the ratepayers, who have thus both the incentive and local knowledge needed for remodelling these foundations, we must look to take the initiative. To the ratepayers should be assigned the right of calling the attention of the proper authorities to the state of the endowed elementary schools within their districts.

Let the committee of ratepayers in each district be empowered to call in the inspector of the Committee of Council to report on the state of any endowed school founded more than fifty years ago within the district. This alone would make a rapid difference in the working of such schools. The trustees of such foundations would assuredly yield to the force of public opinion thus brought to bear upon them; and indeed, in not a few cases, would be glad to have authoritative information of the state of their trust. A few years would at least show whether the present powers of the trustees are enough to put the schools into useful working order. It might, perhaps, be necessary to enlarge both their powers and the powers of the committee of ratepayers in regard to altering all rules of the foundation which do not relate to the religious teaching; but such powers would at present be premature. It is quite possible that the activity sure to be roused by publicity would show that such powers were not needed.

In the same way, the committee of ratepayers should also have the power of calling in an inspector from the present Charitable Commissioners to examine into and report on the administration of the trust, the state of the funds, and the possibility of improvements. The Charitable Commissioners should be authorised to appoint inspectors for this duty, as their present number would not be sufficient. But of course, if the committee of ratepayers had the right of demanding the visit of an inspector, they might fairly be required to pay him during the time that he was thus employed in their service. The Charitable Commissioners would by this means speedily be enabled to ascertain what further powers they must obtain from Parliament in order to carry out the purpose of their appointment.

The ratepayers would thus have themselves to blame if the

endowments in their districts were wasted from want of any authority to interfere with them, and if, in consequence of this waste, the school rates were heavier than they need be. Nor would the trustees of the foundations often be found unwilling to submit to examination unless in the case of schools of very recent origin. It would, indeed, be advisable to exempt from all inspection schools founded within fifty years, since the trustees in such a case stand so near the original founder that they may fairly be considered, in a very practical sense, his representatives. But the trustees of schools of an older date cannot be allowed to forget that they are trustees, and not founders, and that Parliament, as the supreme trustee, has the right to appoint delegates to see whether or not the trust is fulfilled, and to determine when the letter must give way to the spirit. But, in matter of fact, it is probable that very few would desire to resist publicity. Many of these schools have already applied for inspection by the officers of the Committee of Council. The Committee, holding to its principle of spending its funds only in stimulating voluntary exertions, has hitherto refused several forms of aid to endowed schools unless they would add to their income local contributions of the required amount. It is always difficult to get local contributions for a school already endowed; and many of these schools have thus been excluded from the action of the Committee. But a system of rates instantly does away with every necessity for stimulating voluntary exertions. The endowed schools would be admitted by the side of the rate-supported schools; they would be drawn into the general system, and ten years would probably bring them into a state of thorough efficiency.

The third and last of the requirements mentioned above—viz., the education of the middle classes—seems, at first sight, not so intimately connected with that of the labourers as it really is. But, in fact, the burden of educating the labourers must fall very largely on the middle classes. And the middle classes will not undertake the work with any heartiness while they feel that justice is not done to themselves. There is a good deal of soreness on this point already, and this soreness will assuredly result in recalcitration against all effective improvements as soon as a system of rates, and a consequent control by ratepayers, shall put it into the power of the middle classes to recalcitrate with effect.

The middle classes do not ask for money. They are both able and willing to bear the burden of educating their own families. And, in fact, they would not gain much by shifting the weight on the nation, since little of the weight would thereby be shifted from themselves. It might, perhaps, be

expedient to provide school buildings for middle-class education out of the rates. But the maintenance of the schools as institutions should fall upon the parents of the scholars. The one thing which the middle classes want, and which they cannot get without help, is organization. Let the schools remain self-supporting, but let the systematic action introduced by the Government into the working of Elementary Schools be extended to theirs. Let inspectors visit and examine, let exhibitions and scholarships be founded, let first-rate teachers be distinguished, let the nation give so much money as will organize their schools into a system—and £50,000 a year would completely do it,—and the middle classes can do the rest for themselves.

The beginning ought to be made by re-modelling the Grammar Schools.

The Charity Commissioners found seven hundred and four of these schools in England and Wales. The majority were founded in the seventeenth century, and in fact owe their origin to the same intellectual and religious impulse as that which produced the Reformation. They were intended for the education of the whole community, but especially for that of the middle classes. Already a distinct set of schools for the children of those who were to live by manual labour had begun to appear. The Grammar School was always distinguished from the Elementary, and it was required that a boy should be able to read his own language with perfect ease before he entered. Yet the schools were assuredly not intended for the gentry alone, but rather looked to poverty as a special qualification for admission. The middle classes are thus marked out as the chief objects of the good-will of the founders. Nor is this at all inconsistent with the instruction prescribed. No one can read the wills and statutes by which these foundations were regulated, without seeing that the simple reason why Greek and Latin were made the subjects of instruction was, because no other subject of instruction then existed. On religious questions many of the founders had no doubt strong opinions; but they certainly had no predilection for classical as compared with other studies, and only chose the classical because there was nothing else to choose.

The discipline given by classical study is undeniable. When it has been carried far enough, no other study can generally be compared with it as a means of cultivation. It may be turned into pedantry, as every other good thing may be spoilt by abuse. But the study of the classics in a liberal spirit combines more study of the laws of humanity and of the nature of all that is best in man than any other study yet

devised; and it will ever remain the peculiar discipline for those who are to govern others, and do not happen to possess such genius as to dispense with all discipline. But this may only be said of the whole study, and cannot be said of its mere preliminaries. To learn just enough Latin and Greek to read easy Latin authors with comfort, and easy Greek authors with difficulty, is a very good discipline for a youth, but not better, if so good, as many others which he can now obtain, and as supplying him, not with faculties, but with tools, is in the vast majority of cases utterly useless.

Since the Grammar Schools were founded, there has grown up an English literature, equal in many of its qualities to Greek and Latin, several foreign literatures of not less extent and value, and a whole army of physics and practical mathematics. If refinement be the object of education, and if education cannot be continued beyond school to college, there can be no comparison between the youth who, at the age of seventeen, has to commence his apprenticeship to the world with a taste for the great English, and some knowledge of the great foreign classics, and one who can just construe Horace and Euripides; for this plain reason, if for no other—that the one study will probably be renewed often and often, the other never touched again. A man must go much beyond the point at which a public school leaves him, to acquire such ease in classical reading as to find the pleasure pay for the trouble. If practical utility be the test, there can be no doubt that the youth who comes out of a fair Grammar School has learnt a habit of close attention to what he may be doing which it would not be wise to exchange for anything else; but the actual matter of what he has learnt may as well be immediately forgotten. He probably knows little French, little geography, no German, nothing of law, nothing of the principles of commerce, nothing of the principles of mechanism, nothing of the chief manufacturing processes, nothing of the fundamental principles of any one of those industrial arts by the superintendence of which he will probably have to live. The discipline that he has undergone may possibly give him the power of rapidly learning them, though even that is doubtful; but in the meanwhile another youth of the same age has already learnt whichever of them suits the purpose of his life, and enters the race far ahead of him. Nay, it is not always that the Grammar School youth knows arithmetic enough for a difficult commercial problem, and only those who have tried it can tell how difficult it is to learn arithmetic when boyhood is past. The discipline of Greek and Latin is valuable; but if the education is not to go beyond

school limits, the discipline of learning physics and practical mathematics, English history and political ecomomy, French and German, is, or may be made, equally valuable. And Greek and Latin have nothing but their discipline to give; the other studies are a whole workshop of tools for the business of life.

It is, however, quite unnecessary to argue whether Greek and Latin are the best subjects of study for all boys between twelve and eighteen. The middle classes have decided the point. They will not have the Greek and Latin, and the Grammar Schools are deserted in consequence. The case is reduced to this alternative. These schools were meant for the middle classes; they were meant also to teach Greek and Latin. One must be sacrificed — either the persons or the things. Can there be a doubt which ought to be sacrificed? Can there be a doubt which the founders would have sacrificed? The religious teaching prescribed by the founder, he probably cared for; but it is impossible to believe that he cared for the Greek and Latin, as if these were a sort of sacred tongues. If the schools were reorganized they would soon be filled; but while they teach nothing but the useless Greek and Latin, they remain mere encumbrances.

It is not advisable to diminish the real study of the classics. It would be foolish to drive the study from the great public schools; but in far the majority of the Grammar Schools the study of the classics is a mere mistake, and peremptorily to exclude it from them would be a gain instead of a loss. The line is drawn very clearly by the character of the foundations. Many of these schools are affiliated to the Universities by exhibitions and scholarships. The reorganization of these ought not to be separted from the reorganization of academical studies. They may fairly claim to be let alone till the changes at Oxford and Cambridge have settled into a definite system, and indicated the nature of the improvements required. But there remain 582 with no such affiliation. The exclusion of the classics from these would still leave 122, or, including the public schools, 128 seats of classical instruction, certainly quite enough for the needs of the country.

The first step, then, should be to give every district committee of ratepayers power to prescribe, subject to the approval of the Committee of Council, what shall be the subjects of instruction in all the Grammar Schools within its district that may not have exhibitions or scholarships connecting them with the Universities. The religious teaching alone should be exempted from their authority. The subjects of instruction being prescribed, the district committee should have the further power of calling in an in-

spector from the Committee of Council to report upon the efficiency of this instruction, and an inspector from the Charitable Commission to report upon the working of the statutes. To give greater power than this would be premature. The probability is, that the trustees would be found in all cases most willing co-operators in all improvements. And 582 of these schools put in a condition of thorough efficiency would make an admirable beginning.

What still remained to be done, would, of course, have to be done by building new schools. These schools might be built, if necessary, entirely from the rates; but where possible, partly by rates, partly by voluntary subscriptions. But in all cases they ought to be self-supporting, and the chief share in the management in the hands of the parents of the scholars. The Committee of Council would, at the request of the district committees, inspect them, examine them for prizes and certificates, perhaps throw open exhibitions to competition, which would enable a certain number of the most deserving scholars every year to complete their studies in some more advanced seat of learning; but nothing would be contributed from the Government to their direct support. This would not, however, imply that their doors would be closed to the poor who could not afford to pay fees so high. There might be numerous free exhibitions at these middle schools, open to a competition of all the scholars in the Elementary Schools.

It is conceivable that a real system of education for the middle classes once set on foot might speedily draw into its current more than one large foundation which is now of not nearly the use that it might be. What a stimulus to education all over the country might be given by Christ's Hospital School, if, instead of being filled by nomination, it were thrown open to competition! Its annual expenditure, when reported on by the Charity Commissioners, amounted to £43,155 4*s.* 6*d.* It was educating, boarding, and clothing 1148 children. The education was entirely classical, and quite unsuited to prepare the children for the life which most of them have afterwards to live. Such a school, made into a central school for the middle classes, filled with boys elected by open competition up to the age of fourteen from the whole of England, retaining them free of all charge to the age of eighteen, giving them the most thorough education possible in English literature, the French and German languages, practical mathematics, and the physical sciences, would rapidly become the Oxford and Cambridge of the class for which it was intended. Nor would it really, though it might apparently, be diverted from its object of giving a superior education to the poor. The best,

the only wholesome method of giving superior education to the poor, is to open many avenues for those among them who have superior talents. It is a mistaken charity to take a boy from the class to which he belongs, and to give him an education which very much separates him in thought and feeling from all his kindred, when he has nothing within himself to justify the separation. A boy of superior talents, so treated, will generally learn how to accommodate himself to his double position; a boy of no talents often feels put out of place for the rest of his life, often degenerates back to what he was before. Open exhibitions to take boys from the elementary schools to the middle-class schools, open exhibitions from the middle-class schools to higher schools, open exhibitions for all comers to the Universities, of these let there be many, and the poor will obtain their share; and those who do not obtain any of these prizes will yet obtain the benefit of the general improvement in education caused by the stimulus. Such a stimulus might Christ's Hospital be made. If legal and technical difficulties rendered it impossible to throw open all the nominations at so large a school, to throw open half of them would be much. Six hundred open exhibitions, tenable for four years, or one hundred and fifty vacant every year, would raise the standard of efficiency in every school in the country.

These are speculations, and the time for speculation is well-nigh past. It is still worth while for private thinkers and writers to examine what is the best thing to be done, and what are the objects to be kept ever in view. But for public men the time of action has arrived. It is more important now that some Bill to localize the resources and management of education should be passed, than that that Bill should be the best that can be conceived. An indifferent Bill that can be carried is better than an excellent Bill that cannot. In the earlier stages of such a discussion as this, it is often more important to propose good Bills than to carry indifferent Bills; it is more important to impress the mind of the nation with right views than to lead it for a short distance in right acts. It was for a long time more important that the nation should examine thoroughly the religious, the civil, the economical questions involved in the proposal to educate the lower classes, than that it should undertake to carry out the proposal. A statesman who, whether by a Bill in Parliament, or by public writing or speaking, drew the outline of great ideas, did more service than could have been done by persuading the country to accept any crude or imperfect legislation. But a time always comes, and in this matter it has now come, when delay is more dangerous than mistake. The religious com-

munities must now feel that whatever form may be given by the legislature to institutions connected with education, the season when religious teaching might be thought in danger is now past. In a country like England, which has for centuries surpassed all other countries in readiness to accept what is once done, there can be no doubt as to the power over education which those bodies must exercise which have possessed themselves of 95 per cent. of the schools. If even a secular system were established to-morrow, which every one knows to be impossible, such a system would be so leavened by the necessary introduction of all these denominational schools as to be totally unlike what its name would suggest. But there is no danger of a secular system now, unless a prolonged and obstinate resistance by the denominations to all advance provoke a reaction. The nearest approach to such a system now possible would be some measure like Lord John Russell's, leaving each locality to settle the religious question for itself. But, even in that case, the separate localities are in the same condition as the nation at large; they are occupied by denominational schools, and are indeed much more likely to err on the side of intolerance than of indifference. It is much more likely, for instance, that some very Protestant district would refuse all grants to a Roman Catholic school, than that objection would anywhere be made to the amplest provision for religious instruction. Another danger has now become much more threatening than that which once seemed to menace the religious character of popular education. The Capitation Minute of 1853 was the warning crack of an overstrained machinery. Others like it will be sure to follow. The large towns are already complaining of their exclusion from the benefits of that Minute. It is not probable that the Committee will be much longer able to resist the pressure of this complaint. The extension of this Minute to the towns will cost at least £30,000 in the first year; and out of that it is not likely that one-tenth will be spent in making the schools better than they are now. The money will simply relieve the subscribers of some part of their present burden. The endowed schools will next obtain the permission to reckon their endowments as voluntary contributions. They have been pressing their claims for several years; and when the ear has been opened to such claims in one kind of case, how can it be closed in another? More money will go to them without any guarantee in the character of their resources that it will not be wasted. Next it will be urged that poor districts need only a larger rate of aid to raise them to a more efficient state,

and that the rate of grants under the Capitation Minute should be increased. This, too, has been already pressed; already there are many to propose that the aid should be doubled. This, too, will be conceded. And as soon as the aid has been increased for poor districts, the same demand for justice will extend the increase to all districts. The plain issue to all this is and can be nothing but to place the entire burden on the central revenue. Then follow all the evils of centralization—waste by the local authorities, tyranny by the central. The local authorities, deprived of that spur to vigilant economy on which alone any reliance can ultimately be placed—namely, the sense that they are dealing with their own money—slip gradually into waste, which no supervision can prevent. The central authority struggles to guard its trust by rules which are right on the whole, but tyrannical in detail—and dares not relax those rules when they ought to be relaxed, because experience proves to demonstration that one justifiable relaxation inevitably admits a hundred unjustifiable. From this issue it is the duty of Parliament to save us. Almost any Bill ought now to be welcome which will build up a municipal system to take the place of the voluntary subscribers by the side of the central agency. For a municipal system, if not constructed soon, will now become harder to construct every day. It is impossible to make people believe, when they are drawing from the taxes, that they are spending their own money; and the more they become accustomed to depend on the revenue, the more will they resist everything like a rate. If the legislature does not soon interfere, in less than twenty years we shall have created an education office as large as the Customs, to do the impossible work of controlling all the schools in the country; and we shall be spending five millions to do badly what two millions would do well. It may be yet too early for final legislation. It may be necessary to wait a few years more before we can feel sure that the voice of Parliament would be the voice of the country in the settlement of all the disputed points. Sir John Pakington, indeed, succeeded last year in satisfying many of the requisites of the problem. If Lord John Russell, who has now taken the lead, and has adopted many of Sir John Pakington's conclusions, should succeed in carrying a measure in which they would both agree, it is not likely that the country would afterwards resist; —it is almost certain that the country would afterwards approve; but, if not, a rating bill of some sort, provided only it be not such as mischievously to compromise the future, is now a positive necessity.

CARLOVINGIAN ROMANCE.

CHIVALRY is a wide word, and suggests very different ideas, according as it is viewed from different aspects. Good and evil grew up in it side by side, in the same strange fellowship with which they appear in every institution of mediæval Christendom; lying, so to speak, in broad masses, rather than in the blended light and shadow of a later civilization. The good is recognised by Arnold, when he gives the title of 'the best and holiest of kings' to Saint Louis,—who nevertheless thought it right to smite the blaspheming Jew with his 'bonne épée tranchante,' and who especially patronized the most questionable of all orders, that of the Teutonic Knights; and by Sir Francis Palgrave, who traces, with whatever truth, all 'the purer and nobler forms' of the chivalric sentiment to the nurture and discipline of Ancient Rome. The evil has been insisted on by Mr. Hallam and the Dean of St. Paul's, not less positively than the good. Neither good nor evil, however, are to be judged by the standard of our own times; and there is this broad difference between them: the Antichristian spirit of war and bloodshed, as well as those narrowed feudal relations against which Arnold protests, were both, to a great extent, necessary, inevitable features of the age; to soften which, as far as might be, came the courtesy, honour, and loyalty, making up the real good of chivalry. Compare the rude 'leudes' who surrounded Childebert and Gontran, as we find them painted by Gregory of Tours, with the knights who followed Godfrey to the Holy Land, or with the ideal Roland of the song of Roncevaux. The old Teutonic spirit is as strongly marked in the last as in the first; but there are additional elements—touches of nobleness and elevation quite unknown to the Franks of Gregory. The fierce Mohammedanism of chivalry which led on the Crusades, —perhaps even the old Teutonic ferocity, the 'joy of battle,' the

delight in the 'clashing of spears on the rims of the linden shields,'—may have been in some sort confirmed by the solemn character given to the institution itself, but certainly did not originate with it. A perpetual state of warfare was the necessary condition of those rude, fierce ages; and it almost seems as if the only form in which Christianity could be brought really to influence the life of a mail-clad knight was that assumed by chivalry after it had been taken under the immediate patronage and protection of the Church. Cœur-de-Lion himself, in almost every point, not excepting the love of verse and of verse-making, reminds us constantly of one of his own Viking ancestors: strip him of his chivalry, and he becomes little, if at all, better than an Eric or an Anlaf.

Slowly, as the Church interfered, and as the Christian virtues were brought to bear on the strife-loving knight, there came to be formed an ideal of the chivalric character, to which the warrior looked up with reverence as great as that with which the monk regarded the image of monastic perfection, as set forth in the lives of Benedict or of Bernard. In this ideal, virtues and vices became blended just as in the reality; and the peculiar character of the age, varying as it advanced, is always strikingly reflected in it. Such a pattern of all knightly virtues, although it may never have been thoroughly acted up to, must nevertheless have influenced in a very high degree the manners which went to make up the picture it presented, but which, in its turn, it helped to form and to confirm. Hence the importance and interest attached to mediæval romance. A part of the belief of the times, it is inseparably connected with their history. In this sense, the Charlemagne and Roland of the trouvères are not less true and real than their historic prototypes—the rough King Karl of Eginhard, or the shadowy 'Rotlandus,' chieftain of the Breton marches, whose name is recorded by the same authentic chronicler in the list of those who fell at Roncevaux. It is to this cycle of Carlovingian romance—the most interesting, as being the earliest, and as, more immediately than any other, based on historic tradition,—that we now propose to confine our attention. Nowhere else is the gradual growth of chivalry more clearly indicated. The historic Charlemagne represents a period at which Christianity had already become aggressive, and was beginning to identify herself with the innate combativeness of the Frankish character. Hence the Saxon wars, with their forced conversions; the commencement of an alliance between the sword and the cross which became rapidly developed after Charlemagne's death, and

which had attained its full growth in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, when the romances of the *Douze Pairs* offer us its fullest and most perfect reflection.

Charlemagne himself became, very soon after his death, an heroic personage. Even while still living, the reputation of his wonderful power, spreading over the whole of Christendom, and extending into remote regions of the east and north, may have received some marvellous additions. But afterwards, when he had been seated in grim majesty within the vaults of Aachen, his crown on his head, his sword by his side, and the ivory book of the Gospels open on his lap—in that church of Aachen where had been laid up the presents of the Caliph Haroun, golden brocades of Persia, gems and mysterious talismans from the shores of the Tigris and Euphrates,—the fame of 'Carles li Roi,' the 'King with the snowy beard,' at once increased, and became changed in its character, gathering to itself all the floating tradition, Pagan as well as Christian, which was to be found throughout all the countries where his name was still a household word. In that rude age, when communication from one district to another could only be effected slowly and with difficulty,—when roads were few, and the great lines of the Roman ways, however they may have been cared for by Charlemagne himself, had fallen into decay, and become overgrown by thorns and brushwood under his immediate successors,—when the greater part of northern and western Europe was still covered with enormous forests, wide-spreading heaths, and dreary morasses,—it is not difficult to understand how indistinct rumours rapidly changed themselves into certainties, or how legend after legend sprang up and became established with a vitality not less indestructible than that of the green-branched oaks and beeches under which they were born and nurtured. Only a very few could see the great Emperor as he appears in the pages of Eginhard, gigantic in stature and in strength, the head of his vast body of 'vassi' and 'fideles,' bathing with them in the warm springs of Aix, or wrapped in his winter vest of otter skins, and listening to songs celebrating the heroes 'ante Agamemnona,'—those 'barbara et antiquissima carmina' which had been collected by his express orders. None could see him as modern research has enabled us to do—the greatest and most powerful monarch who ever guided the destinies of Christendom,—governing everywhere by the might of his own individual will,—directing everything, from the studies of priests and bishops to the flowers and vegetables cultivated in the gardens of his villas,—presiding in full armour at ecclesiastical councils,—dictating to popes and princes,—and

stretching the power of his sceptre in a great cross, from the rocks of the Breton sea to the shores of the Danube and the Dnieper, and from the cities of southern Italy to the pine-clad coasts of the then mysterious Baltic. Instead of the real historic Charlemagne there rose up another,—'lesser than Macbeth, yet greater,'—in many respects falling far short of the power and influence wielded by the actual living Emperor, but giving him a new history and new attributes, partly caught from the characteristics of succeeding ages, and partly obtained by blending confusedly together events which had passed during the whole period of the Carlovingian dynasty. How completely all the different countries of southern and northern Europe assisted in forming this picture, and to how great an extent their more ancient national traditions became blended with the glories of Charlemagne and his paladins, we shall more readily perceive after glancing at the series of metrical romances in which the idea of the heroic Charlemagne became finally embodied; and which, thanks to MM. Paulin Paris and Michel, have lately been printed from the stately old manuscripts, once the delight of high-bred dames, and knights the 'mirrors of chivalry,' where, like the sleeping beauty in the wood, they had reposed through so many ages between their delicately-traced borders of strawberry-leaves and wild columbines.

The romances of Charlemagne, it has already been observed, are, more than any others popular during the middle ages, based on direct historical tradition. Those of King Arthur, whatever obscure realities may be mingled with them, are nevertheless so overlaid with supernatural machinery gathered from the misty storehouses of 'wild Wales' and the 'olde gentil Bretons,' that the legends of sea-girt Tintagel and of Merlin the Wise can scarcely claim the title of 'Chansons de *Geste*,' given properly to such romances as are more immediately occupied with the great deeds and warlike actions of their heroes, and have consequently but little to do with the underworld of dwarfs and elves, or with the fairy ladies—Morgana or Urganda—whose dwelling was in the depths of some mountain lake, or amid the green, silent recesses of the forest. Little or nothing of this marvellous spirit-world appears in the metrical romances of Charlemagne, although it became to some extent connected with his name in the vaguer floating traditions of the people. The trouvères deal rather with the more legitimate miracles of the Church—with the every-day belief in omens from bird and beast, or with the shadowy 'visions of the night' which come to warn the great king on his bed, just as they appear in the earlier sagas of the Scandinavian North. Celtic tradi-

tion has very slightly affected the romance cycle of Charlemagne; whilst, on the other hand, the latter contributed many remarkable features to the 'gestes' of Sir Launcelot and his peers of the Round Table. In relation to the cycle of Arthur, Carlovingian romance occupies the same position as that of the *Iliad* to the *Odyssey*. It exhibits no such legend as that of the Sangreal—it has no 'Morgan la fée' and no enchanter Merlin. Its subjects throughout are the wars and great deeds of the 'douze pairs,' their ancestors and successors, from the time of Charles Martel to that of Charles le Chauve, thus embracing the whole period during which the star of the Karlings was in the ascendant. One division alone of these romances can be said to be at all of a less warlike character—that which narrates the birth and early youth of Charlemagne, and which tells of the wanderings and troubles of his mother, 'Berthe aux Grans Piès,' and of that happy time which followed 'quand la Reine Berthe filait'—the golden age when queen Bertha span, and all the world was prosperous. Taking this as the first division, the rest of the cycle embraces—

2. A series of expeditions attributed to Charlemagne himself, but which are purely fictitious, and reflect the character of the first age of the Crusades. These expeditions were directed, according to the romances, first against the infidels of the Holy Land, and afterwards against those of Spain. Their object was to recover from the possession of these sons of Mahoun and Termagaunt the relics of the Saviour's passion—the holy lance, the crown of thorns, and the nails.

3. The historical expedition of Charlemagne against the Arabs of Spain, terminating in the famous diaster of Roncevaux—an expedition which, although it is dwelt on at no great length in the pages of the chroniclers, caught at once the attention of the trouvères, and became magnified to the almost entire exclusion of those wars in Italy and beyond the Rhine, in the prosecution of which the life of Charlemagne was mainly passed.

4. The single romance of *Guiticlin li Sassoigne*, which alone commemorates the Saxon wars and conquests, and

5. The wars in which the Christians of Gaul drove back the Saracens beyond the Pyrenees, and wrested from them all the southern provinces which they had occupied, besides Catalonia on the Spanish side of the mountains. Time and place are mingled in utter confusion throughout this class of romances, the most important of which form an almost independent cycle, known as that of *Guillaume au Court-Nez*.

Of the rude and almost contemporary songs, from which sprang the elaborate Chanson de Geste of the later centuries,

we find distinct traces in the pages of more than one chronicler. The Monk of St. Gall—that great monastery on the shore of the Lake of Constance, founded by the disciple of the Irish Columbanus, and protected and enriched by the piety of successive generations of Karlings,—who compiled his annals at the express desire of Louis the Pious, not thirty years after Charlemagne's death, has inserted long passages, which are evidently direct translations from the 'folk-songs' of Italy and of the countries north of the Alps—such as the scene before the walls of Pavia, where the Lombard King watches the approach of Charlemagne, and the story of the champion Einhere, who drags his horse through the swollen waters of the Meuse.* Half a century later, Benedict of Soracte, who wrote a life of Eginhard, tells us of the journey—half pilgrimage, half crusade—undertaken by Charlemagne to Jerusalem and Constantinople. This is a realm of pure fable, into which popular and monastic imagination had advanced thus early,—a reflection of the character of Benedict's age, in which the increasing dangers of Eastern pilgrimage were already pointing in the direction of the Crusades. To form the later hero of romance, however, strands from remoter lands, and of different fibres, were to be intertwined with these local songs and stories—in many of which the great deeds of elder gods and heroes had already become confused with those of Charlemagne. In the Roman annals, not less than in those of his native north, the knight 'sought his pattern of courage, adventure, and strenuousness.'† 'Don Alexander' was scarcely less a favourite in mediæval Spain than 'my Cid' or Pelayo. The story of 'Sir Orfeo' and his adventures in the realm of Faerie was not less frequently the theme of the minstrel than the lay of Camelot, or the daring deeds and unhappy loves of 'Tristrem the knight, who fought for England.' In short, the old legends of the banks of the Tiber, 'cœlo gratissimus amnis,' retained their power, and assumed a new vitality amongst strange races and under foreign conquerors. We cannot doubt that the general romance of northern Europe, especially in its earlier forms, was greatly influenced by them, just as that of Provence and the Troubadours, which in its turn affected the verse of the Langue d'Oui, exhibits traces of yet more remarkable traditions, resulting from the long-lingering Greek colony of Marseilles. Greek words and Greek choral dances may to this day be heard and seen in the neighbourhood of the old

---

* *Monach. Sangallensis*, l. ii. c. 26, ap. Pertz, *Mon. Germ. Hist.* t. ii.

† Palgrave's *Normandy and England*, i. 34.

Phocæan city;* and as late as the eleventh century there still remained in the Rouergue and the Toulousain recollections of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, which had been taught in the schools of southern Gaul up to the end of the fifth century.

From these sources, then,—early and almost contemporary songs, heathen Teutonic traditions, classical traditions, the colouring of the age given by the trouvère, and perhaps, though to a very slight degree, additions supplied by the trouvère's own imagination, at last arose the complete Chanson de Geste —the full and elaborate portraiture of the chivalry of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. A complete romance cycle, such as that of Charlemagne, deals with the life of its principal hero from the cradle to the grave,—from the prodigies which accompanied his birth to his final disappearance from the scene of his earthly exploits up that 'shining stair' by which, as repeated visions attested, the faithful knight, no less than the sainted monk or hermit, ascended to the joys of Paradise. History is remarkably silent as to the early life of Charlemagne. Even Eginhard was unacquainted with the place of his birth, although he alludes to the great influence over him exercised by his mother, Bertha. The trouvères, however, as in duty bound, seized on all this period, and filled it up with a series of minute fictions, for which, from whatever sources they were elaborated, whether from early songs or from foreign and misapprehended traditions, it is difficult not to suppose that they had some historical foundation, however slight and indistinct. Berthe au Grand Pied, the mother of Charlemagne, was, according to the romances, a daughter of the King of Hungary. She is betrothed to Pepin, who charges the intendant of his palace to seek and bring her home. But this officer has a daughter precisely resembling Bertha. He substitutes her for the true princess; and whilst the 'false Florimel' becomes the wife of Pepin, Bertha is exposed in the great forest of Mans, where she wanders long in the utmost danger and distress, having, says the trouvère, neither 'gastiaux,' 'bescuit,' nor 'godale,'† and being in great fear of the wild beasts, who would eat her, she declares, without the trouble of cooking—'plus tôt crue que cuite.' But the Lady Bertha is reserved for nobler destinies. She finds shelter and protection in the house of a miller, where she remains for many years, humble and unknown, yet winning all hearts by her simple truth and patience, until one day King Pepin, who has lost his way in the chase, arrives at the mill, and is struck with the great

* Ampère, *Litt. de la France avant le* 12me *Siècle*, t. i. p. 125.
† Anglicè, 'good ale.'

beauty of Bertha. She accepts his love, and seizes the opportunity of a nocturnal interview, like Mariana of the Moated Grange, to unfold her true story. From this point all goes well—the traitors are punished, Bertha is restored, and the birth of Charlemagne is the result of King Pepin's chance visit to the solitary mill in the forest.

The romance of *Bertha*, simple and quaint as it is, is filled, like Shakspeare's *As You Like It*, with the life and free air of the woods in which its scene is for the most part laid. No mere description could take us so completely into the heart of those vast forests, the jealously preserved hunting-grounds of the old Karlings, where the wolf howled and the bison wandered, and where the great Auroch—King Arthur's 'Questing beast'—'stalked to its shaggy lair,'

> Through paths and alleys roofed with sombre green.

If the later romances give us the life of the warrior, we have here the face of the country, covered with its waste woods and deserts, alike the retreats of saints and hermits, and the lurking-places of broken men and outlaws. Bertha herself became the ideal of all womanly excellence: for 'domum mansit, lanam fecit,' was scarcely less the highest praise of a mediæval dame than of a Roman matron; and the spindle of 'la Reine Berthe' was her sceptre of happiness and prosperity. She is said to have founded the monastery of Saint Avelle, dedicated, in memory of her wanderings, to Our Lady of the Woods; and a mysterious figure, belonging in all probability to some earlier mythology—'la Reine Pedauque,'—whose one 'goosefoot' appears from beneath the long folds of her robe, became connected with her legend, and was placed among the queen 'nursing mothers' on the exteriors of many cathedrals. Such a statue, apparently of the eleventh century—nearly the time of the romance itself,—still exists above the great portal of the venerable Cathedral of Mans.

After the death of Pepin, his two sons by the false Bertha seize the kingdom, and attempt to destroy Charlemagne; who, still a child, escapes with difficulty to a monastery, and thence to the Court of Galafer, King of the Saracens, at Cordova. Here he remains for some years under the name of Mainet; responds to the love of Galerane, the Paynim's daughter, for whose bright eyes he performs his first deeds of valour, and finally carries her back with him into France, where he kills the usurpers, and recovers his kingdom. Such were the romance legends of the early youth of Charlemagne. The series which follows in order of time, belongs to that remarkable expedition to the Holy Land without which, in the estimation of the crusading centuries, the life of a great hero

would have been altogether incomplete. How early these traditions had arisen, we have already seen. The extent of historical foundation for them seems to have been the negotiations which are recorded as having taken place between Charlemagne and the Caliph Haroun, in order to procure greater liberty and security for the rapidly increasing numbers of Christian pilgrims. But it soon became universally believed that the great Emperor had himself visited Palestine, and had there wrested from the Saracens the holy relics of the Saviour's passion. Even Urban II., according to that version of his famous speech at the Council of Clermont preserved by Robert the Monk, who was himself present there, held up to his audience the examples of Charlemagne and of his son Louis, like whom they were now called upon to march to the deliverance of Jerusalem, 'the royal city—the centre of the whole earth.'* One entire romance yet remains, commemorating the journey of Charlemagne; and allusions to it are scattered thickly through all the other series, interspersed with such various marvels and miracles as could hardly fail to occur in connexion with relics of so great value. The holy crown, made of a 'jonc outre-marin,' thick-set with thorns of exceeding sharpness, blossomed afresh, as though in honour of so great a champion, when the shrine which contained it was opened for Charlemagne's inspection. A savour as of Paradise filled all the place; and the bishop, severing a portion all green and fragrant, gave it to Charlemagne, who, according to one trouvère, placed it in his glove, which remained miraculously suspended in the air until the shrine was again closed. The entire crown, the lance, and the nails, were brought to Rome by Charlemagne, and deposited in the ancient Basilica of St. Peter. But there the romancers did not long suffer them to remain. According to them, Balan, an 'amiral' of the Spanish Saracens, despatched his son Ferabras, at the head of a formidable army, into Italy. He marched on Rome, took, and pillaged it, and carried off with him the glorious relics. In order to recover them, Charlemagne and his paladins undertake a fresh expedition beyond the Pyrenees,—a crusade as completely without historical foundation as that to the Holy Land. But Spain, like Palestine, was sacred ground for the Christian hero; and in the romances which belong to this expedition, together with those commemorating the more authentic 'razzia' of Roncevaux, we have the fullest and most complete pictures of the chivalry of the thirteenth century occurring throughout the whole series of Carlovingian romance.

---

* Roberti Monachi, *Hist. Hierosolymitana*, ap. Bongars. Gesta Dei per Francos, t. i.

There were many causes which led to this great prominence given to the contest with the Spanish Arabs as well by the trouvères of the Langue d'Oui, as by the Provençal troubadours. Charlemagne, it is true, crossed the Pyrenees but once; but from the year 714, when the first Saracen host broke into Septimania, to the beginning of the eleventh century, when they attempted in vain to retake Narbonne, and finally abandoned Gaul, there was incessant strife between them and the Christians of the southern provinces,—a strife which from the beginning had assumed the character of a crusade, and which became more and more a war of religion as the time drew near for Clermont and Peter the Hermit. The knight who fell in battle with the Moors was not less sure of his reward than if he had been stricken under the walls of Acre or Jerusalem. 'The King of Heaven,' says the troubadour Marcabrus, 'has mercifully provided for us a laver' (lavador) 'close at hand,—such an one as cannot be equalled on this side the sea, or beyond it as far as the valley of Jehoshaphat.' In this strife the Carlovingian dynasty had been deeply engaged. Charles Martel had beaten back the Arabs from Poictiers, and had driven them from Provence and Septimania. Charlemagne sought them, though to less purpose, under the walls of Saragossa; and afterwards, when the kingdom of Acquitaine, founded by him as an additional protection, had become broken and divided, it was still the chiefs who had fought under, or revolted from, the banner of the Karlings, who continued the conflict with the sleepless southern invaders. Various races had taken part in these conflicts,—northern Franks, old Gallo-Romans of Provence and Acquitaine, Basques and Iberians of Vasconia and Navarre. The country was full of ancient and famous cities,—Nismes, Toulouse, Arles, Narbonne,—relics of Roman art and magnificence; nor were its natural features less calculated to nurse the spirit of poetry and romance. Between the hostile races rose perpetually that long chain of snowy peaks, glancing waterfalls, and fathomless precipices, the haunt of the eagle and the bear, among whose inaccessible recesses old Basque tradition placed the abode of mysterious spirits and demons, and whose awe-inspiring solitude is recognised in their ancient proverb, which asserts that 'He who has never been in the 'port' of the mountain, or on the sea, knows not how to worship God.'* Through these 'ports,' the work, according to

* Fauriel, *Hist. de la Gaule Méridionale sous la Domination des Conquérants Germains*, iii. p. 64. 'El Bortat,'—a named formed from the Basque 'Portua,' or 'Ports,' was that given by the Arabs to the whole chain. The passes were 'El Abouab,' the gates.

them, of Ionian magicians, aided by fire and vinegar, the Arab hosts came pouring down, with their striped 'haiks' and gilded lances glittering between the rocks, contributing, by the strangeness of their appearance, to the strong impression made by the whole nature of the contest, by the country itself, and by old national traditions. Nor was the Arab character itself without its influence. Charlemagne had formed with them other than hostile relations. The Saracen emir, Soliman-el-Arabi, accompanied by many Andalusian chiefs, was present at Paderborn, in the camp of 'Karilah,' as the Arab writers call him, when, in the year 777, the forced baptism of the revolted Saxons took place there. Their wreathed turbans and damasked swords must have been sufficiently remarkable among the crowd of Frank warriors and priests; but the courtesy and spirit of honour which make Saladin himself one of the most perfect representations of the 'gentle knight,' were far from unknown among the Spanish Arabs, who seem to have given the first great lessons in these virtues to Christian Europe. Peaceful intercourse, no less than the accidents of war, contributed to spread their reputation. Many of the great southern monasteries had a certain number of ships belonging to them, which came up the streams of the Rhone and the Garonne laden with the red leather of Cordova, eastern gems and spiceries, and Arabian silks, brocaded in gold and bright colours, materials for the rich cope or dalmatic; but which also brought with them stories of the refinement and courtesy of the 'heathen hounds' beyond the mountains. Of the direct manner in which the Saracen chivalry was recognised by the romancers, we have sufficient and remarkable proof.

Although the romances which commemorate Charlemagne's expedition to Spain for the recovery of the holy relics belong, in due order of time, to an earlier period, they do not, at least in the state in which we now possess them, exhibit traces of so great antiquity as the famous *Chanson de Roland*,—which title M. Michel has ventured to assign to the Roncevaux romance printed by him from its solitary manuscript in the Bodleian. Whether this be indeed the war-song 'of Roland and of Oliver' which the Jongleur Taillefer sang at Hastings as he rode before the Norman soldiers tossing his two swords into the air, is, perhaps, not capable of proof; but there are certain peculiarities which render it at least probable,—such, for instance, as the shout of 'Aoi! aoi!' with which the long monorhymed divisions are occasionally terminated. Of the whole series of romances connected with Spain, this of Roncevaux is probably the earliest. The famous expedition of Charlemagne,

undertaken, as it has been suggested, with the design of confining the Arabs beyond the line of the Ebro, of securing in Christian hands the passes of the mountains, and thus of checking the constant forays of the Saracens, was perhaps of far greater importance than the brief notices of it in the chronicles would at first lead us to suspect. It is, at least, certain that the two bodies of troops which crossed the mountains, one by the defiles of the Eastern Pyrenees, the other by the passes from St. Jean de Luz, were collected from all the races of the empire, and made up an enormous army. Of the failure of the expedition,—the unexpected check at Saragossa, which Soliman-el-Arabi, the same emir who had been present at Paderborn, had undertaken to deliver into the hands of 'Karilah,'—and the ultimate rout at Roncevaux, where the Frankish army, in Eginhard's gentle words, 'slightly experienced the perfidy of the Basques,'—we know too little to speak with any degree of certainty. Yet this fatal defeat, whatever may have been its real importance, made from the very first a deep impression on the minds of the Gallic population. Rude songs and ballads connected with it existed from a very early period, and formed the groundwork at once of the *Chanson de Roland* and of the prose chronicle of the pseudo-Turpin. The story contained the germ of that deep religious significance which afterwards became more and more connected with all combats against the Moors. Roncevaux was to the Christians what Poictiers had been to the Arabs,—'Balat el Choada,'—the 'Path of Martyrs;' and Roland, who fell there, was made the type of all knightly virtue and devotion. Even Santiago, 'Patron y Capitan-general de las Españas,' himself the active protector of the country against the infidels, was indebted for numberless pilgrims to his shrine at Compostella to the devotion excited by the fate of Roland and his peers, as set forth in the monastic romance of the pseudo-Turpin, which is said to have been compiled with this especial object toward the close of the twelfth century.

The Roncevaux songs and romances were probably the germs from which sprang the series of pure fictions relating to the expedition for the relics. In both we have assembled the whole famous group of the 'douze pairs,'—each of whose characters is rudely, yet distinctly marked, from the recreant knight, Ganelon the Betrayer, to the venerable Duke Naymes, the 'πολυμητις Οδύσσευς' of the company. The central figure is that of Charlemagne himself, now fully developed, and invested with all the various attributes derived from a long and diversified string of traditional sources. The Charlemagne

thus presented to us by the romancers is, in many respects, remarkable. The actual position of the historic monarch had been in a great degree exceptional. It was by the force of his individual character alone that he had so completely succeeded during his lifetime in mastering all the powers of Christendom. No succeeding monarch fills so completely the entire historical canvas, to the exclusion of all the lesser chiefs and nobles. What is called the feudal system was as yet but in progress of development, and the dukes and 'comites' who assembled at the Easter plaids felt each one the direct influence of Charlemagne's unbending will, against which he found it altogether vain to struggle. It was this unlimited power which had raised him to the height of an ideal personage; but it was not thus that the romancers could see him. To them he was the Capetan monarch of their own time,—more powerful, indeed, but surrounded, like him, by mighty vassals, scarcely less kinglike or independent. For the trouvère could no more conceive of Charlemagne and Roland otherwise than as the feudal king and baron of the twelfth century, than Brother Anselm or Brother Hildebrand could image to himself Saul or David combating with any other arms than the steel-ringed hauberk, pointed helmet, and broad Norman sword, in which fashion his hand had so cunningly depicted them upon the pages of his great Monastery Bible.

As though by way of compensation for the real power of which they had deprived him, the romancers confer on Charlemagne certain other attributes of a far more marvellous character. He becomes, in their hands, the representative of those mighty old giants of the North, one class of whom was held to be as well disposed toward the ordinary race of mortals as the other was hostile. Like Starkodder, the Norwegian champion, whose tooth served for the clapper of a church-bell, Charlemagne is of enormous size and stature; yet 'gent ad li cors,'—there is nothing deformed or ungainly, and such is the native majesty of his countenance, that the stranger who once looks on it has no occasion to ask who he is. His beard, white as hawthorn or the laurel-flower, falls below his waist, like Thor's; and when he is enraged or anxious, it is his habit to stroke and pull it, in due Oriental fashion, and to twist his long 'gernuns,' or moustaches. No wonder that his beard is white and his head 'tut flurit.' Like Nestor, or like Hildebrand, the champion of Theodoric, his years have long exceeded the usual limits of the life of man. He has been two hundred years in Spain when the defeat of Roncevaux takes place, thus spending nearly his whole lifetime in combating the Moors,—for 'in my judgment,' says Marsilie, 'amiral' of

Saragossa, the romance representative of Soliman-el-Arabi, 'dous cenz anz ad e mielz.' His famous sword 'Joyeuse,' with its inscription, 'Decem præceptorum custos Carolus;' his spear, which was never lifted against an enemy but it was sure to give a fatal wound, and which became confused with the holy lance of Longinus, brought back by him from Palestine; the banner of St. Maurice and the Theban legion, always borne before him, and always striking a mysterious terror into the hearts of the infidels,—assist in making up the picture; which, it must not be forgotten, was received by the Jongleur's audience as perfectly authentic,—none the less so on account of its marvels, for 'God,' in the words of Biorn of Drontheim, when attempting to account for the good swords and supernatural armour of the old heroes of the *Wilkina Saga*, 'was well able to bestow all these things on them, and even as much again.' With all this, however, Charlemagne himself takes little or no active part in the romances. Grand, solemn, and almost supernatural, he fills the central place. The inspiration and the glory stream from him. But the deeds of strength and of daring, the single combats and adventurous expeditions, are undertaken by the chiefs and paladins who surround him, and who, in their turn, are not less marvellously favoured and endowed. They are, in short, great feudal barons, with a colouring drawn from the stores of an older religion, just as Charlemagne is the feudal monarch, with the attributes of Thor or of Odin.

All the 'douze pairs,' with the single exception of Ganelon, are faithful to Charlemagne. But the great pattern of fidelity, as of most other knightly virtues, is Roland. He it is who exhorts the others, in their greatest difficulties,—when the countless host of the Saracens is approaching, and the destruction of the Christians seems inevitable—

> Ben devuns ci estre pur nostre rei;
> Pur son seignor deit hom suffreir destreiz
> E endurer e granz chalz e granz freiz.

Never, he continues, let a 'malvaise cançun' be sung of us, who have the right on our side. Great, however, as is the advance beyond the rude chiefs of Gregory of Tours, and even of the Niebelungen-lied, the paladins of Charlemagne still exhibit a certain ruggedness of character very far removed from the *gentilesse* of the Black Prince, or of the 'sans reproche' Bayard. True, they are combating the infidel sons of Mahoun, with whom no faith was to be kept; yet it is a striking proof of the extent to which Arabian chivalry must have influenced that of Southern Europe, that the most remarkable example of knightly courtesy occurring throughout all these romances

should be assigned, not to Roland, nor even to Charlemagne, but to the Saracen giant Ferabras, during his combat with the paladin Oliver. The *Romance of Ferabras* is one of many which must have existed commemorating the Spanish expedition in quest of the holy relics, but almost the only one now remaining. Few of the Carlovingian series had a wider reputation;* and even Don Quixote's niece and housekeeper could not find it in their hearts to commit it to the flames. Ferabras himself, who, at the end of the combat, touched by supernatural grace, and by the arguments of Oliver, declares his readiness to embrace the Christian faith, is the romance representative of the true or 'faithful' giant, well known to old Northern tradition, just as St. Christopher represented him in the more solemn legends of the cloister.†

The religious element, never altogether absent in these Saracen romances, appears curiously in the sudden conversion of the giant; too courteous a personage, as it would seem, to be allowed to remain a worshipper of 'Bafom' and 'Mahoun.' In the Roncevaux 'chanson' it is conspicuous throughout; and perhaps the most striking scene to be met with in the whole range of romance is that which occurs after the fatal battle, where Roland, mortally wounded, drags himself over the field, and gathering, one by one, the bodies of the 'douze pairs,' arranges them, kneeling as though still alive, before the Archbishop Turpin, who has just strength to pronounce his absolution before he, too, sinks down beside them. Thus Roland is left alone, the only survivor of all that mighty host; and then follows the attempt to break his sword, Durendal, 'the heavy striker,' in which he only succeeds in splitting the rock from top to bottom. The entire passage curiously exhibits the working of trouvère after trouvère, each having added in succession his own version of Roland's address to his sword. It displays so well the general character of these romances, that we shall attempt a translation of some portion of it, including the death of Roland. The 'olifan,' which Charlemagne hears beyond the mountains, has already been sounded:—

Then once again Sir Roland struck the block of Sardine stone,
Where on the mountain-side he stood, of all that host, alone.
Loud rang the brand, yet brake not; no splinter fell away—
No fragment bright and glittering, on the ground beside him lay.
And when he saw no strength of arm might burst the brand in twain,
With a low and mournful voice, Sir Roland spake again:—

* Robert Bruce, during the famous night-passage of Loch Lomond, read to his followers the Story of *Ferabras*.—Barbour's *Bruce*, b. ii., v. 832.

† Grimm. *D. Mythol.* 496.

'Ah, Durendal, my sword! thou art fair, and clear, and bright;
How thou shinest in the sun like a ray of fiery light!
King Charles he sat alone, in the country of the Moor,
When an angel of the Lord stood that mighty king before,
And he bore thee, Durendal, thou sword of fiery glance,
And he said the King should gird with thee a noble peer of France:
So Charles the gentle King, who was ever first in fight,
Girt thee firmly to my side in all the douze-peers' sight.
And I won with thee, my sword, both Namon and Bretagne,
And all the land of Poitou, and all the land of Maine;
And the Norman saw thee shining, and the Lombard on his plain,
And the fields of fair Provence, and the hills of Acquitaine;
And we won the woods of Brabant, and Flanders by the sea,
And Rome, that mighty city, and all wide Burgundy.
Constantinople heard thy strokes upon the hawberks ring,
And we made the Saxon people bend low before the King;
All the cities and the countries we won with many a blow,
Where ruleth Charles the King, whose beard is white as snow.
And now for thee, mine own good sword, the tears are falling down,
That I must die, and leave thee in the country of Mahoun;—
Thou who sittest in the heavens—Thou who watchest from on high—
Save the realm of France, I pray Thee, from shame and villany!'

Then once again Sir Roland struck the Sardine stone with might,
Till the sparks flew round about him like the shooting stars at night;
Loud rang the noble brand, yet no splinter fell away—
No fragment bright and glittering, on the ground beside him lay.
And when he saw no strength of arm might burst the brand in twain,
All softly to himself, Sir Roland spake again:—
'Ah, Durendal, my sword! thou holy sword, and fair,
Within thy hilt of gold, lie relics strange and rare:
The blood of holy Basil—the robe of Saint Marie—
And Saint Denys' hair, who aideth us in our extremity;
It fitteth not that heathen men should bind thee to their side,—
Thou oughtest in a Christian land for ever to abide.
It fitteth not that Godless men should win thee, sword of mine,
Who didst smite the heathen Saxons, beyond the river Rhine,—
Who didst conquer all the lands where ruleth Charles the King,
Whose beard is long and white, like the laurel-flower in spring.'

Beneath a lofty pine-tree, Count Roland dying lay,
The sun shone o'er the Spanish land, toward the close of day;
And he thought of pleasant France, and the cities wallèd high,
And how of old he won broad lands, fighting valiantly,—
And of Charles the King, his master, he who girt him with the sword,
And of the Lady Alda—she who pledged to him her word.
He might not choose but weep, for he knew his end was nigh,
And evermore for mercy he called to God on high:—
'Oh, holy Father of the world, to Thee I cry this day,
Who didst Lazarus call forth from the tomb wherein he lay,
Who of old preservedst Daniel within the lion's den,—
Thou Helper of the sorrowful—Thou Keeper of all men,—
Save my spirit from the evil one, and blot out all the crimes,
Whilst the life was in my body, wrought against Thee oftentimes.'
And then, to prove his words were true, he flung his gauntlet high,
Where Saint Michael the Archangel watched o'er him silently.—

With his sword beside him laid, about the closing of the day,
And his palms together on his breast, his spirit passed away.
But God sent down his angels, a bright and burning train,
With Michael, who doth guard the ships upon the stormy main,—
And to the gates of Paradise, with hymns and harpings high,
They bore the spirit of the Count. God grant us so to die!

Thus fell Roland the Good—the 'wall of clerks'—the 'staff of orphans'—the 'tongue,' like Thomas of Ercildoune, that 'knew not how to lie.' A hermit, from his cell in a distant wilderness—so the legend asserted—beheld the vision of angels, and heard the celestial music with which his spirit was conveyed to the regions of the blest. So St. Maurus, at Auxerre, had seen in an ecstacy the lighted way by which Benedict of Nursia had ascended, after his death at Monte Casino. Like Charlemagne, Roland was an inheritor of many marvels connected with the old Northern Champions, and, as in their case, his fall is succeeded by earthquake, storm, and thunder.* But in no respect is the influence of Christianity on the national literature, and on the heroic ideal, more strongly marked than in such a death-scene as this at Roncevaux. The old Greek hero, let his toils be what they might, could look to no reward after they were ended—

Ψυχη δ'ηυτ' ὄνειρος αποπταμενη πεποτηται.—

Even the joys of the northern warrior in his Valhalla were but shadowy. But when the faithful champion of Christendom had fallen on his last battle-field, his happiness was only commencing; and the paladins of Roncevaux became a great army of martyrs, whose blood had been shed in defence of all that was true and right. White and red roses, so it was believed, sprang up over all the field, and shed their fragrance through the mountain valley. Roland was gradually invested with every conceivable chivalric virtue; and over the whole scene of his death a half-saddened, half-triumphant character was thrown, till its touches of tender feeling, in the midst of the surrounding strife and grimness, remind us of the delicate leafage and flower carvings that here and there shine out from their capitals through the solemn gloom of some vast old Gothic cathedral.

The chivalry of 'le bon Troyen Ector'—the strength of Samson—the 'gentil cœur, loyal et preu,' of Judas Maccabæus—even the wisdom of Solomon—are all bestowed on Roland in the rhymed chronicle of Philippe Mouskes, toward the middle of the thirteenth century. But although the old Canon of Tournay may seem to have painted a very complete picture

* Grimm, *D. Mythol.*

of the perfect knight, one type yet remains which was not represented by Roland. Don Jorge de Manrique, in those famous 'Coplas' which are to this day popular in Spain, places side by side the two modes of life which in mediæval estimation were held specially to merit the divine favour,—that of the monk in his cell, and that of the knight, spent in combating the Moors. Distinct as they appear, a tendency to the union of the two was very early exhibited. It finally resulted in the formation of the religious orders of knighthood; but its first indications appear in the lives of those early chieftains who, after a long career of war and tumult, retired to end their days within the walls of some peaceful monastery. The knight thus, to use a remarkable expression, 'sub baltheo aureo amorem Dei retinens,' is eminently a figure of Carlovingian times. In the romance of that cycle he is represented by 'Guillaume au Court-Nez,' 'Guillaume de Toulouse,' 'Guillaume d'Orange,' 'Guillaume le Moine'—for by all these names, and many more, he is known—'li meillor home qui onc béust de vin' of the trouvères, the 'jejunii amator, in vigiliis pervigil' of the monks. Throughout, the romances of Guillaume rest on historical foundations. After the Roncevaux defeat, William, who had long been a constant companion of the Emperor, was appointed Count of Toulouse; and during the fresh stream of Arab invasion under El Hakem, 'Modzafer,' the Victorious—his name is always conspicuous until the fall of Barcelona and the establishment of a Christian seigneury beyond the mountains—the germ of the future Catalonia. He then disappears for a time; but only to emerge into greater celebrity as the founder of a monastery in the valley of Gelona, one of the wildest in the Cevennes, the church of which, Byzantine in character, and decorated with marbles probably obtained from the ruined temples of Nismes, still exists to remind the visitor of the once-renowned Count William. The little patches of earth lying between the rocks that everywhere break upwards along the steep sides of the glen, were carefully cultivated by the Count-abbot and his monks. Vineyards and cornfields took the place of rough fern and brushwood; and the last glimpse which his monastic biographer affords us of the former scourge of the Saracens exhibits him mounted on his 'asellus,' and carrying at his saddle a great flask of wine for the benefit of the exhausted reapers in the harvest-field.

The life of 'Saint Guillaume du Desert'—one of his many names, and that by which his monastery is still known—was in itself so remarkable, and displayed so strikingly the characteristics of the monastic warrior, that we can hardly wonder at finding him selected as the grand representative of this especial

type of chivalry. His fame was spread by monk as well as by jongleur, since he belonged equally to both.* When the chaplain of Hugh of Avranches, one of the Conqueror's most powerful barons, was instructing the knights and soldiers who thronged his master's castles in the deeds of the warriors of the Old Testament, and of their later Christian imitators, George and Demetrius, Theodore and Sebastian, Maurice and Eustace, he used also to add something concerning the 'holy athlete' William, to whom Charlemagne had bequeathed his noble sword 'Joyeuse.' Ordericus Vitalis, who records this, also tells us that although many jongleur songs existed on the same subject, 'the authentic relation' of the monks was to be preferred, from which he has himself compiled the short life of St. William, inserted in his history.

The incidental notice thus afforded us by Ordericus as to the character of the sermons in Count Hugo's chapels, is a curious illustration of the manner in which, from an unexpected quarter, the ideal chivalry of romance was brought to bear on that of actual life. Count Hugo's chaplain no doubt handled the matter somewhat differently from Adènes, the 'King of the Minstrels,' or from Turold, the 'maker' of the Roncevaux Chanson. But the groundwork of both monk and trouvère was the same; and the effect of the latter's romances—bolder, more varied, more brightly coloured—must have been at least as powerful as that of the soberer teaching of the Churchman. If we would thoroughly understand how far the tales of 'haute emprise,' the 'Lays' of Roland and of William were really calculated to affect an audience in recital, we must forget the well-printed volumes from which we now read them at our firesides; we must even dismiss the original dusky manuscript, with its borders of griffins and strawberry-blossoms, and its capitals of burnished gold and vermeil. In their stead, call up the great hall of some Norman 'ferté,' whose smoke-stained walls are bristling with hawberks and lances, dinted in many a fray, and reddened on many a battle-field. All the 'following of the baron is there assembled. Near the chief himself, and on the dais, sits the jongleur, who has claimed shelter for the night, and who is declaiming to his harp the old song of Roncevaux. See the flushed brows and the kindling eyes of his listeners—see how each sword-hilt is half-unconsciously grasped—and listen to that fierce shout, stirring the banners on the walls, the 'Aoi!' with which the minstrel concludes

* In the romances, his religious character is supported by long prayers—each a summary of biblical history,—which he recites before every great battle.

his 'branche' before he sets down his harp, and drains his horn of mead or spiced piment. Or take another scene —under the great plane-tree below the walls of some fortalice in Gascony or Acquitaine. The minstrel is telling the same old tale; and far off in the distance rise those very mountain passes where his scene is laid—or it may be, nearer at hand,

> The splendour of the setting sun
> Streams on thy mirrored wave, Garonne,
> And Blaye's empurpled shore.

Blaye—where Roland himself is resting, with his sword beside him and his horn at his feet. But whether in the 'worm-eaten hold' of the Norman baron, or beneath the glowing sky of the south, the same spell is in the strain, the same magic in the singer. His song is alive; and if it tells of deeds many hundred years old, its spirit is that of the present hour—of those who are at this moment listening to it. Roland is dead, and all his peers; but there are brave knights still in the world and honour is still to be won. The children of Mahoun and Termagaunt are still there beyond the mountains, and the Saracen dogs are still polluting the soil of the holiest of lands. 'Aoi!' shout the knights. 'For France and for Saint Denys! We will throw in our lots with Roland—we will fall with our faces towards the Moors—and St. Michael aid us in our extremity!'

The extreme warlike excitement which these romances were calculated to produce, cannot for an instant be doubted. Urban II. and St. Bernard must have found them excellent coadjutors. But, in their later forms at least, they taught more than this; and it is not a little interesting to trace the gradual addition of nobler qualities to the 'strength of Samson'—the great distinction of a rude age,—on which the earlier songs for the most part dwell. To this addition the Churchmen greatly contributed; until, indeed, their ideal of the Christian knight rose far beyond any actual illustration which can be produced from the stories of the trouvères. Such, for instance, is the speech which the Canon of Tournay has placed in the mouth of Charlemagne—a lament over his nephew Roland.* The excellencies, in short, which at last came to be showered on Roland and his peers were so great, and as the age of the crusades advanced, the manner of their death appeared so glorious, that they were eventually raised to all the dignity, and surrounded by all the emblems,

---

* *Chron. of Philippe Mouskes,* edited by M. de Reiffenberg, t. i. p. 330.

of actual saints of the Church. In one of the magnificent stained windows of the Cathedral of Chartres, Roland, his head encircled with the saintly nimbus, is represented in the act of cleaving the 'sardine-stone' with Durendal, whilst the Divine Hand, in the ancient Byzantine manner, is seen extended to him from the clouds. The lives of St. Roland and his companions were inserted in monastic hagiographies, side by side with those of the saints of the cloister. Among the oaks and cork-trees scattered over the opening of the pass of Roncevaux, a small convent was founded, in the church of which the crowd of pilgrims, on their way to Compostella, paid due homage to the memory of the douze pairs. The great 'pantoufles' (archiepiscopal sandals?) of Turpin were shown there; and from the walls were hung the heavy chains of iron which had guarded the position of the Moorish Caliph at the famous battle of Navas de Tolosa, when the white horse of Santiago himself had led on the Christians to their victory. Within this chapel the Black Prince must have knelt and thought of Roland, when, together with Don Pedro, he passed through these 'straytes and perylous passages under the mountaynes,' as Froissart calls them, before the fight of Navarrete. The convent itself was not unhonoured in England; where the cell of St. Mary Rounceval—which stood on the site of Northumberland House, in the Strand—was anciently attached to it. Whether owing to an English desire of connecting our own great romance cycle with this famous spot, or to some more primitive tradition, it was at Montsalvaez (Salvatierra), also on the high road to Compostella, and within a short distance of Roncevaux, that the Sangraal was said to have been preserved in the mysterious temple, where Sir Percival, the Roland of King Arthur's company, alone, of all his brethren, was permitted to discover it.* Roncevaux, however, could not boast the actual resting-place of any one of the douze pairs. Charlemagne himself, at the head of his army, sought their bodies, and conveyed them reverently back into 'douce France'—'the best of all the hundred kingdoms into which God had divided the world.' But even there, so great was the desire to possess their tombs and relics, that scarcely a district of France can be mentioned which did not at some time, or in some manner, claim them. In the ancient church of St. Faro, at Méaux, was long shown the tomb of Ogier, with whose story that of Holger, the champion of the elder Edda, was early connected; and who, as other legends

* Price's *Warton*, (Pref.) p. 82.

asserted, following the true history of Count William, closed his career as abbot of the monastery there. His cowled figure, bearing a staff hung with bells, lay stretched at full length above; whilst round the sides of the tomb were ranged Roland and the other peers, with Charlemagne himself, carrying a branch of lilies for a sceptre. Over the tomb hung an enormous sword and shield, said to have been those with which Ogier, before his death at Roncevaux, in company with John the Priest (Prester John), son of Adgillus, King of Friezeland, had conquered the remotest regions of Asia, and founded there that mysterious kingdom which afterwards became so famous.* Other legends asserted that he and his brethren were buried at Rousillon, at St. Michael's Mount, and in the Aliscamp, or 'Campi Elisei,' the great cemetery of Roman Arles, held in especial honour throughout the middle ages, from its containing so many tombs of martyrs who had fallen in combating

'Paien et Sarrazin
Tur et Persant et felon Bedoïn.'

It was thought that sometimes, when the thunder broke and the lightning streamed across the plain of the ancient cemetery, the gigantic figures of the 'douze pairs' could be seen, hovering over the 'fields of their rest,' and leading upward a long train of less distinguished champions. A tradition, however, which never seems to have varied, asserted that Roland, the best and greatest of the company, lay buried at Blaye, on the bank of the Garonne, opposite Bourdeaux. There he was placed in a tomb, which, in order to keep up his reputation as a giant, was said to be only as long as his knees, with his sword at his head and his horn at his feet. On the tomb was an inscription composed by Charlemagne, his uncle; and some pieces of armour were preserved in the church which had belonged to Roland himself, and which Francis the First, before setting out on the fatal expedition to Pavia, is said to have tried on, and to have found exactly fitting to his size. To see this armour and to reverence Roland's tomb, an annual pilgrimage was made by all the inhabitants of the district. Yet Durendal, the sword of swords, the great treasure of the place, had, it was believed, been removed at a very early period from its place beside the head of its master—if, indeed, it had ever been laid there. The swords of heroes had as great a tendency to multiply as the remains of the most honoured saints, and none were coveted more eagerly than this of Roland. It was shown in nearly as many places as the relics of St. Barbara, or of St. Ursula's virgins; and each of the

* The tomb is figured in Mabillon, *Annales Ord. Bened.*

exhibitors maintained the authenticity of their own Durendal with equal zeal and courage. At Roc-Amador, a famous place of pilgrimage near Gourdon in Querçy, it was hung up in the chapel of St. Michael, one of a cluster built on either side the steps leading up to the chapel of the Virgin, whence the eye ranges over the long valley below, lying like a narrow green thread between its walls of rock. In passing this place on his way to Roncevaux, Roland, it was said, had offered to the Virgin a mass of silver equal in weight to Durendal, and soon after his death his sword was removed here from Blaye.* Another Durendal was exhibited in the treasury of St. Denys,—and another at Liège,—but of all the most remarkable was that which hung at the gate of the Castle of Prusa in Anatolia, in the path of the Crusaders from Constantinople, and which was shown by the Turks as that of Roland the 'Saracen,' who had some Frank blood in his veins, as, indeed, had all the Turks, but who was nevertheless one of their own most renowned and invincible heroes.†

Whilst his paladins were thus honoured, Charlemagne himself had been raised more solemnly to his place among the celestial company.‡ His tomb at Aix was the sacred, strength-giving spot to which the eyes of the German emperors were turned when fighting their own battles against the Papal Hildebrands and Innocents. Otho the Third had opened it, and had beheld the great emperor—still erect on his throne, his face bandaged, and the crown on his head; and Frederick Barbarossa had hung over it a jewelled crown in token of his reverence. Throughout Northern Europe, as in the South, older national traditions became connected with those of King Karl and his peers. The mystic banner, which, as the legends of Friezeland asserted, had been given by the patriarch Shem to Friso, was said to have assisted Charlemagne in his conquest of Rome, and then to have been hung up in the church of Harlingen, where it was long shown.§ The 'Foresters of Flanders' claimed kindred with Roland; and his armour, including another Durendal, was worn by Jean, Sire de Gavre, in 1297, at the battle of Bulscamp.‖ Further north, 'Holger Danske' took his place among the paladins, as we have already seen. Everywhere the ancient

---

* *Bulletin Monumental*, t. xix. (1853.)

† Heerken's *Eginhard*, ap. De Reiffenberg's *Ph. Mouskes*. For the Turkish claim to a Frank origin, see Baudri of Dôle. (*Bib. des Croisades*, i. 23.) Prusa was the first seat of the Ottoman sultans.

‡ The office for his festival was taken from Turpin. (Mart. and Durand. *Voy. Litt.* p. 202.)

§ Kempius, *Frisia*, p. 188.

‖ Kervyn de Lettenhove. *H. de Flandre*, ii. 57.

figures of Justice with her scales, or of the goddess Fortune, set up in the public places of the towns, were connected with the name of Roland, as were the great bells and ward horns which sounded in time of need from the summits of the watch-towers. In the Ardennes and the deep woods of northern France, Charlemagne took the place of Odin, and became lord of the 'wüthend heer'—the wild host of the dead. Roland, his chief hero, follows him when he sweeps along at midnight under the boughs, as Dunar followed Odin.* There was no part of Europe, however remote or uncivilized, into which the romances of Charlemagne did not penetrate. Even in Iceland the sagas of Nial and of Egils were occasionally varied by those of King Karl and his 'cappar;' and in return for Salvaez in the Pyrenees, Wales had the 'Ystoria Carlymaen' to insert among her stories of Brut and of Arthur. Carved ornaments in churches and monasteries, ivory caskets and mirrors, paintings on the walls of royal palaces and of ladies' bowers, all contributed to spread their reputation. The great emperor appears under the most unlooked-for forms and in the most unexpected situations—never more startlingly than as 'the club's black tyrant,

> Who of all monarchs only grasps the globe,

and who, as neither Belinda nor Sir Plume, when engaged in all the mysteries of the 'verdant plain,' were the least aware, is no other than Charlemagne.

In this manner the names of Charlemagne and of Roland had become widely famous in Italy before passing into new life and reputation in the verses of Boiardo and Ariosto. Here, however, we must not follow them; nor must we venture into that later period, when the metrical romances had been exchanged for massive prose folios, still pored over by the Egmonts and the Montmorencis, and when the older chivalry, changing with the changing age, whilst it displayed additional splendour, was nevertheless dying out in its ancient forms, to reappear in that manner and after those fashions which it has ever since more or less retained, and of which the 'influences, it may be hoped, mingling with and softened by purer religion, will be the imperishable heirloom of social man.'†

---

* Grimm, *D. Mythol.* † Milman's *Lat. Christ.* iii. 256.

R. I. K.

THE ROMAN EMPIRE OF THE WEST.*

IT has recently occurred to an advanced and slightly terrorist school of philanthropists that under free institutions it is necessary occasionally to defer to the opinions of other people, and that as other people are obviously in the wrong, this is a great hindrance to the improvement of our political system and the progress of the species. They therefore propose, for the checks and responsibilities of a constitutional system, to substitute an autocracy with no checks except those which may be imposed on the autocrat by his own sense of the eternal fitness of things, and no responsibility, except to the judgment of professors of the political science, for the safety of whose heads, when the adverse verdict of science shall have been pronounced, no adequate provision has yet been made. To secure the ascendancy of reason in politics, the autocrat is to be elected through a process not yet determined on, by the uneducated part of the nation; and to purify government from class influences and antipathies, and inaugurate the fraternity of men, he is to represent the interests and feelings of the lower classes against the upper. In our time and country probably the fulfilment of this theory would have raised Mr. Feargus O'Connor to the throne, or rather to the altar; and the first measure of that eminent leader of the proletariat would most likely have been to create a few dozen dukes; his second, to take off the heads of writers of Roman history and editors of Greek classics, as obviously useless to a proletariat republic founded on the organization of labour. This bright hope of a demagogic tyranny for the future, with which Mr. Congreve feels a cultivated sympathy, has not failed to throw back its light upon the past, and in the clear and interesting *resumé* of the history of

* *The Roman Empire of the West.* Four Lectures delivered at the Philosophical Institution, Edinburgh, Feb. 1855. By Richard Congreve, M.A., late Fellow and Tutor of Wadham College, Oxford.

the Empire before us, it gilds the cruelties of Caligula, the extortions of Caracalla, and even the brow of Tiberius.

Hitherto we have believed that the Republic was the youth and manhood of Rome, the Empire its decline; Mr. Congreve has arrived at the opposite conclusion. With him the Empire is the manhood, the Republic is the infancy and youth; and the history of the latter is to be studied only as preparatory to the organization of the former. The question naturally arises,—If the Empire was full of that moral, intellectual, and physical vigour which the analogy of manhood implies, how it came ever to decay? Why did not everything continually grow better, stronger, more capable of resisting destructive forces both internal and external, under the 'type of all good government,' as Mr. Congreve gallantly styles it? Why did not intellect become invigorated, patriotism and public spirit increase, the bonds of society strengthen, and the whole system become consolidated day by day? Mr. Congreve says that Gibbon makes the decline begin from Commodus. Gibbon, however, points to causes of decline anterior to Commodus; though his peculiar temperament, and his peculiar views of religion and morality, did not suffer him to appreciate the deepest causes of national decline, or to see the seeds of corruption in a system under which, when administered by a mild emperor, an intellectual voluptuary would have been perfectly at his ease. But we must again ask—Why did decline begin, even with Commodus? Commodus was not worse in himself than Nero or Domitian; and he had been immediately preceded by the best and ablest emperors in the whole series. Mr. Congreve, we presume, will hardly fall back on the false analogy between states and individuals, and argue that nations full of political ability and virtue, and ruled by the type of all government on the principles of reason and justice, must yet, like men, inevitably decay.

Mr. Congreve represents, and is not alone in representing, Cæsar as a man with a grand ideal of popular and cosmopolitan monarchy, which he deliberately set himself to work out by a policy which was not less beneficial because it furthered his own supremacy. Cæsar is being gradually surrounded with a strange halo of fictitious splendour by the adorers of his fortune and his sword. One writer represents the religious scepticism which he shared with all the voluptuaries and political adventurers of his day, as the result of an exhaustion by his great mind of the whole of philosophy, terminating in a grand despair. Another would have us believe that his avowed readiness to sacrifice political honesty to the attainment of absolute power was a philosophic preference

of the higher moral object to the lower. Really these gentlemen would have prospered under the type of all government. Cæsar was a demagogue, it is true, but a hypocritical demagogue; he used the political lazzaroni of the Roman power most unscrupulously for every purpose of faction and sedition; but it would be very simple to think that he ever intended to hand over the prize into their hands. He had no sooner grasped supreme power than he faced about upon the revolution, formed his government with the aid of the senatorial chiefs, put down the popular guilds which he had compelled the senate to restore, turned the popular element out of the courts of justice, and disfranchised nearly half the rabble whom he had led, to save his exchequer the largesses of corn. The first triumvirate completely dispels the notion that he was the sincere advocate of any popular principle, whether derived from Marius or from any purer or nobler source. Some of his political associates, such as Catiline and his crew, were desperate and ruined members of the nobility, who had been partizans of Sylla; while some of his chief admirers, such as Cato, Brutus, and Cicero, were enemies to Sylla's name and acts. His political friends were men whom we cannot, with the utmost exertion of historical charity, believe to have been actuated by any aims grander than those of ordinary political pirates; although to the enthusiastic vision of a German historiographer, they may appear to have been the apostles of a new era of things, whom the opposite party ought immediately to have recognised and adored. They were bound to their leader by the simple tie of pecuniary corruption. That leader himself was pledged in an immense sum of debt to achieve the regeneration of his country and the liberties of the human race. He was not borne into power, as Mr. Congreve says in one passage, by the people, but, as he more correctly says in another passage, by the army of Gaul, which had been equipped for him by the senate, with that magnanimity which it always showed in supporting its political adversaries when in the field for the Republic, and which he systematically converted into a body of debauched and licentious, though brave and highly-disciplined prætorians, by a process the reverse of that which Cromwell employed to train his Ironsides as the servants of a great cause. The prætorians, however, we observe, are fast being absorbed into the general theory, and becoming political missionaries—the organs and supports of a beneficent revolution. Their sale of the empire to Didius Julianus, will probably some day appear in a new light, as an effort to invest commercial transactions with a dignity which they had not previously attained.

What were the actual measures of Cæsar when he had obtained supreme power and had *carte blanche* for the regeneration of the universe? He very properly introduced a strict system of criminal law among his old fellow-rioters, and, as we have said, docked their largesses and put down their clubs. He reformed the Calendar,—a useful work, which the despot ordered and the astronomers performed. He projected a codification of the law, which Cicero seems to have projected also,—just as the Convention left the *Code Napoleon* in their bureau. He planned several great public works, which requires no great effort of genius on the part of any one who has an unlimited command of public money. He showed a liberal taste by opening a public library,—a munificence which Lucullus had anticipated, and perhaps exceeded, by opening to the public his own. He formed a scheme for restoring Carthage and Corinth by transporting inhabitants to them, which would perhaps have been more gratifying to the historical sentimentalist than advantageous to the persons transported. He remitted a portion of all debts, wisely, perhaps, but without much more effort or expense than it cost a mediæval king to remit, for the sake of God, the debts which his subjects owed the Jews. His attempts to revive and enforce the censorship of morals and the sumptuary laws were in the narrowest and most pedantic spirit of Roman antiquity; though Herculean efforts are made to show that they were more rational when made by the lover of Cleopatra than they would have been if made by Cato. The measures which he took for the purpose of recruiting and stimulating Roman population, admitted on all hands to have been futile in themselves, clearly indicate a design of repairing and strengthening, not of merging the dominant race of which their author had become the chief. His extension of the freedom of the city to his own province of Gaul, and to his favourite legion, Alauda, and his introduction of a number of his own Gallic officers into the senate, were clearly measures of personal policy, like Sylla's enfranchisement of his political army of Cornelii; and the bestowal of a privilege on a particular province, so far from implying that all privileges were to be abolished, implied distinctly that they were to be retained. The gift of citizenship to all men of science was a more generous measure, but even this is stated by Suetonius (who was not at all in the secret of the cosmopolitan dictatorship) to have had for its object the increase of population in the city. But what do the Neo-Cæsareans say to the creation of a new batch of patrician houses? How do they find a place for this in the democratic theory? We could furnish them, if they will, with a very ready, though commonplace explanation, and even

with an historical analogy, if they please, in the aristocracy recently created by his democratic majesty, King Suluk. But do these measures, all taken together, amount to, or indicate any real attempt to deal with the great evils of the Roman world? They display, no doubt, a genius for government and national organization, acting in the plenitude of that despotic power which enables even mean capacities to become, in the eyes of the educated vulgar, the master-spirits of their age. But can they soberly be said to display conceptions at all beyond the reach of any able Roman of that age? Can they be said to display conceptions equal in liberality to those which are found in the political philosophy of Cicero?

Modern Cæsarean writers make a great flourish of trumpets, and place the reform of the Calendar in as favourable and striking a light as they can; but they are obliged, after all, to own that the reform of the Calendar is not the regeneration of the world; and therefore they find it necessary to assume that the recorded measures of the Dictator were only parts and germs of a greater scheme, which he was prevented from executing by his death. But this assumption seems to us (with deference be it said) to be merely the play of a religious fancy, anxious to save the reputation of its idol. Cæsar, when he was slain, was not meditating further constitutional reforms; he was about to set out, and had sent on the legions, for a Parthian war. None of his successors ever referred to his divine counsels. No principle was proclaimed, no standard but that of vengeance was raised by his party after his death. His friend Matius, in defending his memory, in a long letter to Cicero, says nothing about any magnificent schemes for Rome or the world which had been cut short by his death. We are fervently enjoined by Mr. Congreve to study 'every recorded word' of the 'master of Roman policy,' and the study might lead us to some information respecting his views of political improvement which the ancients did not possess. But we really know no recorded words of Cæsar's relating to Roman policy, unless it be his favourite Greek apothegm, that if you mean to play the rogue, you had better play the rogue for absolute power.

Cæsar, indeed, though a great soldier, and very successful, and therefore entitled to unlimited admiration, does not seem to us to have been the sort of man who was likely to find a remedy for the great evils of the world at that time. The great evils of the world at that time were atheism, immorality, conquest, and slavery, the consequence of conquest. Cæsar was a sensualist, an Epicurean, and an atheist. It is vain to represent his atheism as anything but atheism, especially

as it was accompanied in him, as in Tiberius and Caligula, by a very grovelling superstition. So far from being competent to infuse a new principle of moral life into the mass of corruption, he was scarcely competent to perceive the use of any moral principle, except in an oratorical point of view. As to conquest, he was the incarnation of its most ruthless and unscrupulous spirit. No member of the senatorial party could more entirely regard the world as the 'legitimate prey' of Rome. He goaded the peaceful Lusitanians to war, merely to enrich himself and his soldiers by their plunder. He records with naked grandeur the slaughter of half a million of Gauls. Suetonius says that he stormed towns merely for the sake of booty. His invasion of these kingdoms was as unprovoked as the late aggression of the Pope. He kept Vercingetorix in store for several years, and then butchered him to grace his triumph,—the same triumph at which he outraged the magnanimity, if not the chivalry of Rome, by insulting the misfortunes of a woman and a queen in the person of Arsinoe. He wanted to annex Egypt, for the purpose of pillaging it. He procured, through Claudius, the infamous decree for the dethronement of Ptolemæus, King of Cyprus, and the confiscation of his treasures, with the double object of gorging the people and furthering an intrigue (singular in a man who is represented as so remarkably free from intrigue) against the honour of Cato. Nor does he seem to have been a great philanthropist even towards the provinces, since by him or through him, and to reward attachment to his interests, Gabinius, Piso, and Sallust were furnished with spheres of plunder and oppression. But everything is pardonable, and not only pardonable but enlightened and beneficent, in a man with an idea. The senate ought to have stopped in its career of conquest at Numantia: Cæsar was quite right to carry the arms of the Republic into Gaul; and we have no doubt he would have been quite in the right if he had conquered Parthia also, though it seems a sound diplomacy required his successors to let it alone. He has been termed by M. Michelet 'the man of humanity;' but as he was what we have described, and, moreover, an enormous butcher of gladiators, the epithet must apply rather to the laxity of his morals than to his extraordinary regard for the rights and feelings of his species.

We are a little jealous of the apotheosis of Cæsar, because it is an inconvenient and embarrassing principle, that a man who has, or fancies he has, a political idea, may identify that idea with his own supremacy,—get together a set of desperadoes,—use without scruple every instrument of intrigue,

faction, and corruption,—debauch the armies of the state,—levy civil war in his own interest,—and then, perhaps, die with the idea still undeveloped in his head, and leave the world, in which he has extinguished every principle of government and order but himself, it may be to anarchy, it may be to Neros and Caligulas. We claim a right to look into the antecedents of saviours of society, who identify the salvation of society with their own attainment of absolute power. And we must insist on crediting Cæsar, not with the great and beneficent measures which, if he ever conceived them, he did not carry into effect, but with the tyrants to whom he bequeathed the dominion of the world.

Mr. Congreve lectures, as it were from the pulpit of destiny, the republicans who refused to accept the judgment of events, and speaks of them as convicted of folly by their impotence after the death of Cæsar. But after the death of Cæsar they were for some time masters of the government and the army; Cæsar's best officers served under them, and his legions formed the greater part of the forces of Brutus and Cassius. If Antony had died with Cæsar,—if Hirtius and Pansa had not fallen at the crisis of events,—if the success of their fleet had been made known in time to Brutus and Cassius,—if the centurion of Cassius had not lingered at Philippi, Destiny would scarcely have vindicated her hierophants. We must remember that the restoration of the Republic was thought practicable, not only by Brutus and Cassius, but by Germanicus. The assassination of Cæsar produced at least one good effect,—the beginnings of Despotism are always popular and moderate; and Rome enjoyed the beginnings. Modern Cæsareans may be consoled by the reflection, that though the man died, he must soon have died in the course of nature; and that the institution revived and lived. They do their theory injustice by making so much depend on a single man. It is a question, not between the Republic and Julius, but between the Republic and all the Cæsars.

Mr. Congreve is inclined to say that, though Augustus was Cæsar's heir and pupil, his policy was less liberal than that of Cæsar. He is certainly concerned to maintain this view, though we do not know how he is authorized to do so. The policy of Augustus was an attempt to restore old Rome, and his government was as thorough a government of the upper classes as the world ever saw. He tried to patch up the respectability of the senate, and to purify it by a high pecuniary gratification. He endeavoured to restore ancient manners, himself a libertine, with a libertine for his minister,

and a libertine poet to celebrate and popularize his reforms. So far from having any plans for the enfranchisement of the world, he was very sparing in bestowing the freedom of the city, and by his will enjoined the government to pursue this policy, expressly in order that the distinction might be preserved between the dominant and the subject races. He also forbade the enfranchisement of slaves; though he paid a graceful tribute to humanity by mildly rebuking the voluptuous friend who was in the habit of throwing his slaves to feed his lampreys. If this was the policy of the second founder of the Empire, is it possible to believe that, either in the mind of its first founder, or in any other mind but those of recent theorists, it was a vast scheme for reversing the wrongs of senatorial conquest, and establishing, on a basis of liberality unprecedented then, and unapproached since, the rights and relations of mankind. At what period after Augustus did this ideal come into being? Or did it lurk in the mind of Augustus himself, and was he so severely practical as to treat the realization of his own ideal as a dangerous abuse?

Mr. Congreve, who in one part of his book treats the empire as a positive blessing, and the model of all good government, even at the present day, elsewhere treats it, less alarmingly, as a blessing relatively to the then state of the Roman world. Tacitus tells us, what we should naturally suppose, that the change from the government of the senate to the government of the emperors was accepted with satisfaction by the provinces. Nor could we much deplore the extinction, in the interest of the conquered world, of the narrow liberties of a conquering nation, though we must not forget what the narrow liberties of Greece and Rome did for the political, and still more for the intellectual progress of mankind. But there seems much reason to doubt whether the hopes of the provincials were fulfilled, and whether that government which had a Nero or a Tigellinus for its centre, really diffused through its circumference prosperity and justice. Count Franz de Champagny, in his admirable work on *The Cæsars down to Nero* (which we cordially recommend to the perusal of imperialists), has collected a large number of facts tending to a contrary conclusion, and we will venture to say that his statements will, on verification, prove correct. His profound knowledge of the subject leads him to affirm that the Roman tyrants disliked the provinces, and that if they governed in anybody's interest, it was in the interest of the mob of Rome. Mr. Congreve suggests that the cruelties of Caligula to the Romans had a deep meaning, and was the exaggeration of that side of the imperial policy which marked out the emperors

as the representatives of the whole empire, as distinct from the exclusively Roman element,—a side of the imperial policy, we may observe, which would have seemed rather strange to the Roman people, whose tribunes Mr. Congreve supposes the emperors to have been, and who, according to him, bore the founder of the Empire to his demagogic throne. But, unluckily, Dion Cassius has narrated the atrocities personally committed by Caligula in Gaul. Mr. Congreve also thinks that the words of St. Paul, which have hitherto been taken as a general precept of submission to constitutional government, were really a special tribute of approbation to the blessings of the imperial government, even under a Nero. St. Paul belonged to a country where the name of an imperial collector of the revenue was a by-word, and where imperial soldiers increased their wages by extortion. He was one of a sect founded by a just man, of whose blood an imperial procurator (not a proconsul) had washed his hands before he delivered him over to be crucified. He had himself been scourged, stoned, and imprisoned, without law. He came to Rome, because he would not bribe imperial judges, to die for no crime but that of teaching and practising a pure religion. His nation was a singular instance of what Mr. Congreve represents as the gentle and harmonizing influences of the imperial system. Having, alone of all the nations in the world, a real religion, and refusing to be absorbed into the general worship of the Llama of a sensualist despotism, they were systematically outraged, and at last exterminated. The Jews mourned beside the ashes of Cæsar; but from those ashes sprang Titus. Under the able reign of Diocletian, the earth swarmed with the consuming hierarchy of extortion, so that it was said that they who received taxes were more in number than they who paid them; and, from the general misery, infanticide was common. Gibbon says that from that period it would be easy to deduce an unbroken series of complaints. Caracalla, driven by the furies of his brother, made a regular tour of rapine and massacre through the principal provinces of the empire. Before a barbarian had set foot in Italy, a large district of Campania was lying uncultivated, and therefore exempted from taxation. A good emperor would no doubt treat the provinces well, as his property; but a bad emperor had no public opinion to check his misgovernment; for in those days, at all events, there was no controlling hierarchy of political science to announce, with the voice of an oracle, that pillage and murder were not in accordance with the laws of nature as observed by positive philosophy. Augustus himself, visiting the Cæsarean province of Gaul,

clearly convicted its Gallic and Cæsarean governor, Licinius, on the complaint of the natives, of extortionate and oppressive practices, nearly resembling those of Verres. But, instead of punishing him, and being a terror, as Mr. Congreve says the emperors were, to evil works, he lightly dismissed the complainants, and hushed up the whole affair, in order, Dion Cassius expressly says, to avoid scandal to the government,—accepting the sinister excuse that the money had been extorted for the benefit of Rome and of the Emperor. In the evil days of Verres the Gauls would at least have found a Cicero.

The Roman senate, however they may be abused as having looked on the world merely as a prey, were widely and honourably distinguished from all other conquerors of the ancient world by their system of graduated privileges and progressive incorporation; and it would be difficult to prove that the Empire was animated by any more liberal idea. The policy of Augustus, in this respect, was, as we have seen, scandalously retrograde. Claudius admitted some natives of Gaul, his own native province, to a senate which was then no longer an assembly of kings, but a puppet assembly of sycophants and slaves; and the speech which Tacitus puts into his mouth on this occasion is liberal, though we may well doubt whether it is really the speech of the imperial dotard or of the friend of Trajan. But, be that as it may, the precedents quoted by Claudius to justify his liberality, are taken from the practice of the Republic. When the name of Roman citizen became worthless, and implied no immunity from taxation, imprisonment, death, or even torture, at the will of a despot, it was forced on the whole world by what Mr. Congreve rather mildly describes as the fiscal considerations of Caracalla. Without the intervention of any fixed policy of enfranchisement, the Roman military population became exhausted; and the provinces gave soldiers, generals, emperors to Rome.

Neither can the Empire be said in any way to have renounced the spirit of conquest, though there was not much left to conquer, and the power of conquering gradually failed, through the decline of patriotism and valour, and the fatal influence which the cold shadow of Despotism exercised on military as on all other talent. Its diplomacy was just as unscrupulous, and proceeded in just the same way, by breeding up pretenders and fomenting intestine quarrels in foreign countries, as that of the senate in its worst days.

That the Roman emperors were in one sense popular is true. Like even Louis Quatorze, they feared the mob of the capital, and bribed the cobblers with bread and shows while they bathed in the blood of the Lamiæ. But the people, if they

were gorged with the slaughter of provincial gladiators, and fed with food torn from the mouths of the provincials, can scarcely have been elevated either in a moral or industrial point of view above their condition in the days of the Republic. And if they were degraded, it would be making too much of the blood of an aristocrat to suppose that it could mitigate their degradation. The great evils of society, so far from being removed, were aggravated. Luxury advanced to a pitch of grossness which left far behind the luxury of Lucullus. The gulf between the rich and the poor grew wider, and nowhere is the misery and degradation of poverty painted more feelingly than in Juvenal. The concentration of property in a few hands, instead of diminishing, increased, so that at last six proprietors owned the whole province of Africa. The old aristocracy was exterminated, and with it the old aristocratic code of morals; but a new aristocracy arose, as a new aristocracy will rise round any court—the aristocracy not of the Scipios and the Æmilii, but of Sejanus, Pallas, and Tigellinus. We need scarcely speak of the morals which are painted by Tacitus, Suetonius, and Juvenal. A new moral principle, such as the world had never seen, did indeed appear under the Empire, and commence the regeneration of society, the purification of the human soul, and the reconciliation of poor and rich, the freeman and the slave. This principle appeared, and the Empire recognised the affinity of a kindred power by immolating Christianity to its own diabolical pride.

It is singular, considering that consensus which positive science has shown to exist between all the functions of humanity, that while the state of the political faculties under the Empire was so high, the state of all the other faculties should have been so low. Mr. Congreve dispenses himself from considering the history of literature under the Empire, and we cannot but think that he exercises a wise discretion in doing so. Literature there was; but in almost every department it was a wretched decrepitude of the literature of the Republic, and ranks as low as possible among the works of human mind. One great historian and one great satirist the Empire produced; but both were inspired by enmity to those beneficent institutions which, as the first intellects of their time, they ought especially to have appreciated and admired. If there was a danger of such occurrences under a popular monarchy, it would be requisite to suppress literature, and be content with political science.

Mr. Congreve dwells, not without reason, on the merits of the imperial law. We confess we should feel a certain moral incongruity of a disagreeable kind if this great benefit to

modern society had really emanated from the Roman tyrants. But the work of liberalising the Roman law and adapting it to the needs of humanity was performed entirely by the Stoic sect, the enemies and martyrs of the Empire. To that sect all the great jurists of Rome belonged. We may therefore see in the civil law a monument, not of licentious and despotic force, but of philosophical intellect and public virtue, excluded by baser powers from the government of the world, but still devoting themselves to the service of humanity, and rearing a monument which has long survived the tyranny under which they groaned, and which to them might seem eternal. The first legal mitigation of the lot of the slave is supposed by some to have taken place about the time when, Nero having not yet broken out upon the world, the government was in the hands of Seneca and Burrhus; and it seems to have been confirmed by Hadrian, who was much under the influence of the Stoics.

Mr. Congreve applauds the religious unity of the Empire, and seems inclined even to think that the worship of the emperors was not altogether irrational or injurious. The religious unity of the Empire was simply a unity of irreligion; and when a real religion appeared, the Empire persecuted it. Gibbon forgot that to the politicians of the Empire one religion did not seem 'equally useful' with the rest. It was that religion which preached not only the purest morality, but the highest civil duty and the truest loyalty, and which sought to obliterate the social distinctions and antipathies of the world without disturbing its peace, by teaching that in God all are free, and bidding the master kneel down at the Eucharist beside the slave. Let it not be forgotten that it was to the image of Cæsar—to the deified embodiment of 'the type of all good government, that the Christian was required to burn incense or die. Mr. Congreve has suggested that the supposed offence of the Christians was mutiny. But what sort of police for a paternal government must that have been which mistook St. Paul for a mutineer? We remain of opinion that when Christianity came into contact with sensualist Despotism, a power of good came into contact with a very great and very magnificent power of evil, and that the power of evil was led by its own nature to attempt to exterminate the power of good. The Empire having first attempted to destroy Christianity, ultimately corrupted it by imparting to it its own tyrannical unity, and teaching the Church to persecute heretics in turn. Mr. Congreve seems to think that the persecution of the Arians was a service done to Christianity, as maintaining the unity of the Church, and fitting her to cope more vigorously with her antagonists. But he regards the whole matter as a

question of organization. And this is the radical fallacy of the imperialist system. The imperialists forget that you must not only have organization, but life; that free thought is essential to moral and intellectual life; and that all varieties of despotism, down to the very latest improvement, have been essentially hostile to freedom of thought.

Mr. Congreve justly feels it necessary, in recommending as a model for the governments of the world the system of imperial Rome, to deal with the question of the succession. He need entertain no doubts that the succession to the Roman Empire was practically hereditary, though the hereditary principle was modified by domestic intrigue, by domestic assassination, and by the childlessness which so often resulted from Roman morals, and which could not be reckoned on as opening a way for adoptive merit to the throne in the case of any modern empire. Cæsar was prevented by Roman prejudices from bequeathing his power to the son of Cleopatra, though there is some evidence to show that he intended, even in the face of these prejudices, to legitimize Cæsarion, and make him his heir. Octavius had the discretion to put Cæsarion out of the way, that there might not be too many Cæsars. Cæsarion being out of the question, the Empire passed in the same family down to Nero. The line of the Cæsars was then lost in an abyss of civil war. Hereditary succession re-appeared again with the Flavian line. After Domitian came a series of emperors without heirs, who adopted successors of more or less merit, the series ending with Marcus Aurelius. Marcus Aurelius was a man, if there ever was one, who might have been expected to sacrifice the interests of his family to those of the human race. Yet even Marcus Aurelius saw the rising vices of Commodus, and bequeathed to him the dominion of the world. If the principle of hereditary succession was not openly avowed, but veiled under the name of bequest, in deference to the lingering pride of the nation, that only strengthens the case against those who may be disposed to quote the Roman empire as a proof of the practicability of a despotism not hereditary, but devisable, and which should be devised to merit. When you have once made a man absolute, you cannot place him under conditions; and no sovereign who is not under conditions can be expected so far to disregard personal affection and family influences as to leave the crown out of his own family; nor would the heir acquiesce in the deprivation. Those who mean to risk the fortunes of humanity on any such arrangement must have the discretion to revolutionize human nature before they revolutionize the governments of the world.

It is vain to speak of the Roman Empire, or of anything

analogous to it, as a provisional autocracy rescuing the nation from faction, and tending to fit it ultimately for self-government. Inconvenient and disagreeable as it may be, it is only in the water that people can learn to swim. We see from the correspondence of Pliny with Trajan what was the civilization of the Roman world under one of the best of emperors. It is the civilization of a sheepfold. The commonest local improvement cannot be undertaken without a reference to the central government at Rome. One may be quite sure that such subjects would have been scared at the idea of self-government, had it ever been presented to them by the angry gods. Such is the inevitable tendency of an arbitrary government. A good despot feels responsible for everything; a bad despot will have everything subject to his licentious will,—religion, education, everything will be drawn into the vortex; and, as a necessary consequence, all self-reliance and all power of self-government will dwindle, not increase, day by day. Everything will be centred in and held together by one man, who may be a tiger or a madman. The idea of a provisional despotism as a means of training a nation for self-government, whether as existing in the past or as possible in the future, seems the wildest of all chimeras. It seems like a proposal to strengthen a man's limbs and faculties by making him walk on crutches and forbidding him to exercise his mind.

Before we conclude, we cannot help attempting to rescue Marcus Aurelius from the hands of those who would use him as a model of despotism, and a grand instance in favour of absolute power. His name may well excite the imaginations of all who are inclined to a revival of the Roman Empire; though we must remember that even his reign was disturbed by a rebellion, and that even he persecuted, or allowed his police to persecute, the Christians. But the fact is, that though it was impossible at that day to restore liberty to those who had long been unaccustomed to political action, and who had so long been dead to patriotism and public virtue, no man ever was less in favour of despotism than Marcus Aurelius. He was far too good, to say nothing of his wisdom, to desire absolute power over his fellows. His reign, and that of his predecessor, were, in fact, a protest against the government of force. The emperor, in these reigns, was, as far as he could be, the chief of a constitutional state, and the minister of the laws. The great stoic emphatically expressed his conviction that the will of the one ought not to prevail over the reason of many. He was a man who knew the value of moral freedom, and desired to leave men free,—who knew his own nature, and desired to be under law. He is simply calumniated

and degraded when he is quoted in favour of despotism, whether ordinary or demagogic.

Let us admit, however, that the Roman Empire, if it was very far from being the enlightened, humanizing, tolerant, popular, and progressive institution which it appears to Mr. Congreve to have been, had its justification. That justification lay in the misgovernment of the provinces during the later days of the senatorial *régime*, and the difficulty, almost amounting to an impossibility, of any effectual reform. The system of representation, even if it had occurred to any politician of that age, was out of the question, inasmuch as no Roman citizen would have consented to delegate his vote; and the bestowal of the franchise on the Italians had only made matters worse for the provinces by filling the assembly which elected to the offices of government with a venal mob, brought up from the country by political adventurers, and dead alike to national honour and the responsibilities of empire. Under such circumstances, resort might naturally be had to monarchy as the one hope of impartial rule. That hope was frustrated, as we believe, through the fearful effects of despotism on the brain of tyrants who found themselves absolute masters of the world, and absolutely free to gratify their passions without the slightest restraint either from the fear of man or God. But the situation was one for which no analogy can be found in the political circumstances of European nations at the present day. It is preposterous to compare the various classes in a nation to the various nations in the Roman Empire. The suggestion only shows the unhappy tendency to treat government as an eternal war of classes, and politics as a religion of hate. The only thing in the Roman Empire analogous to the dangers and evils of modern society, was the war between the different classes of society in Rome itself. And we see how the Empire dealt with this. It destroyed all the better part of the upper classes, and substituted for them a new upper class of imperial freedmen and sycophants far more luxurious and more oppressive than the old. As to the slave class, it gave them occasional openings as informers against their masters, and raised individuals thereby to the height of infamy, but never attempted to raise the whole body to the level of justice. Under a humane emperor, the lot of the luxurious nobles—with their immense villas, their armies of slaves, and the whole world open to their luxury—was such as a Gibbon might regard with envy. Moral and intellectual degradation apart, they probably passed very happy lives; as happy lives, perhaps, as the French nobility passed at Versailles while the people were eating grass. But they were

vile in the midst of their luxury, and further removed from sympathy with the people than the old nobles who had expounded the law to their clients, and sought the great offices of state at the hands of the people.

We must further observe in regard to any attempted comparison between the Roman Empire and the demagogic despotism proposed for society at the present day, that the Roman Empire stood alone in the world. Whatever democratic or tribunitive spirit it might have in it at the commencement, would not be corrupted by evil communications with hereditary despotisms of an ordinary kind. There were no kings to form alliances with, no Popes to be crowned by, no Austrian archduchesses to marry. However omnipotent, the Roman tyrant was alone and without support. His power over the minds of that race of sycophants and slaves was immense, as the reigns of terror which followed Augustus showed; but when that power was exhausted, there were no Austrians in reserve. In the present day, if a democratic despotism were erected, it would very soon be converted into a more familiar object by the sympathy and attentions of neighbouring potentates, not scrupulous about the legitimacy of any ruler who has succeeded in placing his will above the evil principle of law, nor anxious to inquire whether the reverse of the coin bears 'Republic' when the obverse bears 'Emperor.' And when the limits of submission were reached (and we presume that even Mr. Congreve places some limits to submission) the mutual insurance of despotisms would come in to support the principle of order threatened in the sacred person of a Nero.

Finally, the position of the Roman emperors was partly justified as that of commanders-in-chief of the armies of the civilized world, constantly threatened by the pressure of barbarism on its frontiers. They carried on war, not with more vigour or perseverance than the senate, but, perhaps, with more unity; and though great generals like Germanicus and Agricola were not unfrequently sacrificed to their jealousy, they were sometimes great generals themselves. Their action, as military protectors, was their chief claim to the loyalty of the nations under their sway. A single nation, in spite of what Mr. Congreve says, carries on war much more vigorously as a republic than as a despotism, for the obvious reason that a republic will never enter into a war in which the hearts of the people are not engaged; and Mr. Congreve, who wrote at the beginning of the present war, may now, at its close, see the difference between the perseverance of an autocrat and that of a senate. But a vast group of nations like that which formed the Roman Empire could scarcely use its military power with

effect, except under a single chief. We have no such consideration operating in the case of modern civilization, and we must, therefore, not include it among the motives for concentrating power in the hand of a single man. Moreover, constant military employment was furnished for the Roman armies, and they were kept, for the most part, on the frontiers, not in the heart of the empire. This, with the surviving discipline and the surviving military honour of the Republic, enabled the government long to hold at bay the dangers of prætorian domination. A modern empire must have its armies idle and in the heart of the country, with the feeling of their political power constantly present to their minds, and in case of a failure of the imperial line, they must rule the succession.

All rational men are ready to have imperialism, like any other theory of political improvement, freely discussed. We are already familiar with it in the *Leviathan* of Hobbes. We are not discussing it now; we have merely been speaking of Mr. Congreve's view of the Roman Empire as a great demagogic institution. That Empire remains, in our eyes, what it was before,—a tyranny which perhaps Rome had deserved, and which may or may not have been worse for the world than the tyranny of the senate and people. It was the natural offspring and scourge of a society without morality and without a God. We trust that humanity will never see its like again.

G. S.

THE END.

LONDON :
SAVILL AND EDWARDS, PRINTERS, CHANDOS STREET,
COVENT GARDEN.

DATE DUE

DOMINICAN COLLEGE LIBRARY
AC5 .O93 v.2
/Oxford essays
3 3645 00074988 0

25906

AS122 .093 1855
vol.2
Oxford essays

Dominican College Library
San Rafael, California

S0-BPZ-345